Gautam, Shrimati Sheela (Aligarh)

Gupta, Shri Indrajit (Midnapore)

J

Jaswant Singh, Shri (Chittorgarh)

Jatiya, Shri Satynarayan (Ujjain)

Jha, Shri Bhogendra (Madhubani)

K

Khanoria, Shri, D.D. (Kangra)

Khurana, Shri Madan Lai (South Delhi)

P

Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarayan (Mandsaur)

Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas (Rosera)

Prabhu, Shri R. (Nilgiris)

Prasad, Shri Hari Kewal (Salempur)

R

Raju, Shri Bh. Vijayakumar (Narsapur)

S

Shakya, Dr. Mahadeepak Singh (Etah)

Singh, Shri Ram (Haridwar)

Swami, Sureshanand (Jalesar)

T

Tirkey, Shri Pius (Alipurduars)

V

Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari (Lucknow)

Y

Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet (Azamgarh)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Subject to Correction,* the result of the division is as follows:

Ayes	148
Noes	023

The Motion was Atopted

14.29 hrs

MOTION *RE*. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION.

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now the House shall take up the next item. Shri Eduardo Feleiro to move it.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): Sir, I beg to move:

> " That this House do consider the present international Situation"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, if, every single Member in this House is aware that at this point of time and in the recent past, global changes which are historic in nature and

---

*The following Members also recorded their Votes.

Ayes Shri Mohanbhai S. Delkar, Shri T.R.L. Bhosale, Shri P. Valial Peruman, Shri P.C. Chacko, Shri Avtar Singh Bhadana, Shri Kartikeswar Patra, Shri Sarat Chandra Pattnaik, Shri P.P. Kaliaperumal, Shri K.H. Muniyappa, Shri R.G. Willams.

Noes Shri M.V.V.S. Murthy, Shri Rabi Ray, Shri Srikanta Jena, Shri Syed Shahabuddin, Shri Chetan P.S. Chauhan, Shri J.V. Singh Drona, Shri T.C. Khandelwal, Shri Bhuvan Chandra Khanduri, Shri Shyam Bihari Misra.

[Sh. Edurado Faleiro]

radical in character have taken place and are in the process of taking place - changes which are political but are also strategic, changes that are economic and are also social. If I may mention a point of reference to these very valid changes, I would submit that the point of reference would be to the end of tha cold war, the end of the period of confrontation between the super powers and the beginning of a new era of cooperation, not merely between the super powers but among all the great powers of the world. And indeed, nowhere else is this cooperation better expressed than in the United Nations Organisation itself which, for the first time is fulfilling the role for which it was founded—the role namely, of great powers working together towards peace and working towards progress of mankind.

Whilst we obviously, unconditionally, totally and fully welcome this spirit of cooperation and the end of the cold wer, indeed, we see a indication of the very foreign policy which was laid down by Pandit Nehru and followed by successive Governments - Congress Government and non-Congress Governments. While we see this end of the confrontation period as a vindication of the entire principles of the non-aligned movement, we do believe that the spirit of cooperation, this sphere of working together must spread beyond the devaloped world, beyond the industrialised world and beyond the great powers of all the countries of the world. Therefore,we believe that is we are to begin and I have mentioned about the United Nations Organisation - there must be a greater democratisation of the United nations Organisation taking in account the realities that have taken place, the new powers, the new great powers that have emerged since the United Nations was created.

Two years from now in 1994, the United Nations Organisation will be celebrating fifty years of its existence. In these 48 years, the membership itself of the United Nations have grown 45 as it was at the time of its creation to just above 160. To be precise, we are now with 161 members which gives us about four times the membership of the United Nations at the present as compared to when it was constituted. If we are to take an account and we must take an account of this substantial increase in the membership and if we are to take an account and we should take account, in my submission of the new powers that have emerged, the countries with large population which account for a substantial percentage of mankind at this point of time, then the call will be and the call is on the part of India.

I am happy to inform the House that this call by India had been endorsed recently by the Ministerial meeting of Non-Aligned countries in Accra. The call is for greater democratisation of the United Nations and indeed for the expansion of the security Council of the permanent members and other members of Security Council, to take an account of these realities as the United Nations Organisation finds of the thereshould of its 50th anniversary.

We do believe that in this era of peace, the United Nations Organization must also apply its mind with greetar intensity to the economic aspect of its agendas. It is a fact that while the developed countries having seen sustained retes of growth and prosperity, the developing countries or at least most of them find themselves amassed in poverty, in debt and why not in many of them negative rates of growth. It is necessary that the new and more just international economic order should address itself to thesa genuine concerns of the developing countries. Why are the prices of the commodities produced by the poor collupsing and why are the Prices of the commodities and the goods produced by the industrilised countries keeping up growing all the time? The call goes from India and goes from many other developing countries. The call is for giving more content and substance to the North-South dialogue and the call is also for strengthening South South Cooperation.

I have broadly outlined the international scenario and how we see it. Please permit me a few minutes to mentions about the outstanding events that have taken place in the field of our foreign policy and diplomacy over the last few months or in the very recent past.

Sir, the relations with our neighbours-it is a priority on our diplomacy. Before I go into the bilaterel relations and major events, I would like to express hare with all the force at my command tha view of tha Governmant of India and of this Governmant. The original grouping of tha countries of South Asia which goes by the neme of SAARC must be strengthened and wa fully support it. We see SAARC as an instrument - the best instrument - of collectiva self - reliance of the countries of this region. We along with other countries, members of the SAARC, identify and continue identifying the projects which will encouraga and take advantage of the complementary peace of this region for mutual benefit.

When I speak about the developments in the neighborhood and our relations with our neighbours, I should begin with Pakistan. I must mention about he visit of the special envoy of tha Prime Minister of Pakistan, who was also tha Foreign Secretary of that country, and who visited India during the last month. He came with a message saying that now we must open a new cheaper, a new era, in which confrontation must give place to peaceful dialogue. So, when the special envoy told this to the Prime Minister and other leaders, our reaction was obvious and was clear that those are preciously the sentiments which have been ours throughout. All our problem cannot be solved by violence; cannot be solved by force and cannot be solved by confrontation. India and Pakistan are not just tow poor countries. As per the United nations and accepted categorisation, we ar among the very poor countries and the money that wa spend in defence is not merely against our principles; the principle to which wa are committed-tho principle of peace ad non - violence-but is also against the very process of development and will be much better used both by India and Pakistan, in our view, for the development and welfara of our own people. Tharefore, we have but to reciprocate and it came naturally to us to reciprocata the sentimants expressed by the special envoy on behalf of the Prime Minister of Pakistan. We told him that the sentiments are reciprocated but, what we need is not merely sentiments and expressions of sentiments. What we need is action on the ground and we told him that we looked forward to action on the ground on the lines of the sentiments expressed by him. By action on the ground, we meant stoppage by Pakistan of sits assistance to terrorists in Kashmir end in Punjab.

By action on the ground , we mean stoppage by Pekistan of hostile propaganda of disinformation carried against us in internationel fora. By action on the ground, we mean stopping the voilation of the Shimla agreement end trying to internationelise the issue of Kashmir and other issues which are bilateral, which have to be settled bilaterally.

The House is aware that at a recent meeting of the Ministers for non-aligned countries in Accra, the Pakistani delegation once again raised the question of the Kashmir in that international forum. I would like to inform the House that this was rebuffed by the conference. Th Chairman of the conference who happened to be the Foreign Minister of Ghana rebuffed it by sayinq that such bilateral issues are not be raised in Non-Aligned Movement and no such bilateral issues will be permitted to be raised in non-aligned forum in future.

The House would like to know as to why the Foreign Secretary level talks have been postponed. At the last meeting of the Foreign Secretaries in Delhi, it was agreed that some preliminary meetings would taka place before the next round of the Foreign Secretary level talks. The meetings concerned some issues like Tulbal Navigation Project, questions like Sir Creek, some Military delegation and the drug trafficking , etc. Out of all these meetings, only one could take place and that was regarding the drug trafficking. About all the other meetings, the Pakistani Government expressed its inability to have them

[Sh. Edurado Faleiro]

and asked for postponement. When they asked for postponement of the Defence delegation meeting, they also suggested and understood that we would also like to have content and substance in the Foreign Secretary level talks. We ourselves did not like to have these talks unless there Preliminary meetings are held. Therefore, these Foreign Secretary level talks were postponed to give an opportunity for other meetings to take place, so that there is content in the foreign Secretary level talks. We except these talks to be held in the end of October, next.

We had recently the visit of his Majesty the King of Bhutan. He had been the ruler of that country for a long period of time and he is a friend of India. There is no doubt that the talks that he had during his visit—which was the first after the new Government took over—were most fruitful and kept both the sides extremely happy with the outcome.

The Bangladesh Foreign Minister was also here in the month of August. We made some advancement on the outstanding issues.

As far as Nepal is concerned, the high level task force has been constituted. It was decided to create it as the time of the visit there of our former Prime Minister Shri Chandra Shekhar. Therefore, this high level task force was created. The high level task force is the first exercise of this kind between India and Nepal and it is intended to impart new dimensions and new dynamism to the unique and traditional relations between Nepal and India. Two meetings of the high level task force have been held so far. The first one was on 4th August 1991 in Kathmandu and the second one was in New Delhi on 2nd September 1991. The next meeting is scheduled for the 6th October 1991.

As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, the House is well aware of our position which is endorsed by all the Governments here. The position is that we stand for the integrity and unity of Sri Lanka; but at the same time we are concerned and we believe that the legitimate rights of the Tamil people there must be fully safeguarded. We do believe that Indo-Sri Lanka agreement, the Rajiv-Jayawardhane agreement provides the best and effective frame work for this settlement that we visualise in Sri Lanka.

The Foreign Minister of Sri Lanka was here. At that time an agreement was signed to establish a Joint Commision. The Joint Commission is to be chaired by the Foreign Ministers of the two countries on an alternate basis and will initially incorporate two sub-commissions—one dealing with trade, investment and finance and the other dealing with social, cultural and educational matter. The sub-commission meetings are scheduled for 7-9 October and the Joint Commission meeting is expected to take place before the end of the year.

Afghanistan is in a substantial manner also a neighbour. We welcome the plan of the United Nations Secretary General for a political settlement of the Afghan issue.

We are confident that this plan is in line with our own approach to the Afghan question which is to have a strong Afghanistan, to have independent Afghanistan, to have a non-aligned Afghanistan.

Our Prime Minister has visited Germany and the visit to Germany was to inaugurate the Festival of India there. Therefore, it was virtually cultural in principle. The other Co-Chairman is Chancellor Kohl . He took that opportunity to have discussions at the political level on the Global situation and also on the bilateral matters. The visit was an enormous success in as much as Germany is concerned with so many problems and so many commitments in Eastern Europe. It reiterated and stated very clearly that the level of cooperation - economic cooperation - with India will continue and it will not be decreased. That was really a very outstanding achievement of the Prime Minister, in the circumstances in which Germany finds itself.

The relations with Japan have been good and we see them as better and will be on the upswing in view of the new economic policies.

Soviet Union has been in long relationship with us and has an important relationship with us. I want to be brief and therefore I want to say only this much at this point of time that the Soviet Union is going into a transition.

The supreme relative organ and the people's Deputies Congress is in suspended animation. There is some sort of Supreme Soviet which is in force now, operating the transitional arrangement. The Supreme executive body, the State Council consisting of President Gorbachev and the President of all the Republic looks after the transitory arrangement. The position will crystallise only with the singing of the New Union Treaty. Now this transitory position has obviously created some sort of problems some dislocations. We see these dislocations as temporary. We look forward to having relations with them after the New Union Treaty. We have always established some sort of relations with the Republics as is shown with the visit of Uzbekistan's President Mr. Karimov to Delhi, just before the coup. We have signed some agreement with him. Therefore, we look to a continued and a even further stronger relationship with the Soviet Union in whatever form it appears after the New Union Treaty is signed.

We find our relationship with United States of America of crucial importance. I would like to place on record our appreciation for the positive stance taken by the United States in our negotiations with the international financial agencies. I would like to place on record our appreciation for the stand taken by the United States Administration regarding the Kashmir issue which they said that it was a bilateral issue and it should be negotiated with Pakistan within the Simla Agreement.

Sir, before I conclude, I would like to mention this. After the visit of Shri Rajiv Gandhi to China, there has been a breakthrough in the Indo-Chinese relations. We expect the visit of Shri Li Peng, the Premier of China to India before the end of this year.

Since questions are there for quite some time on what is our stand regarding Israel, I would like to say this much. We do not see the possibility of a durable peace in West Asia unless there is a settlement of the Palestinian issue. Our position regarding Palestine is the same as it was. It is constant and clear that Palestine people are entitled to a homeland; that Israel must vacate all Arab occupied lands; that the Palestine Liberation Organisation is the sole legitimate representative of the people of Palestine.

For the Members in General and particularly for the members like me who come from the coastal area, it will be a matter of happiness to know that our citizens-who had returned from Kuwait or who have been evacuated from Kuwait in the wake of invasion of that country—are going back there. More than 30 thousand people have already gone back to Kuwait and the flights are going full.

The United Nation Security Counsel has constituted a Compensation Fund in which India is also amember. The Compensation Fund is constituted of 30 percent of Oil revenues of Iraq that they sold. One of the objectives of the compensation fund is to compensate people who came back from Kuwait and for the loss that they suffered. We have received more than sixty five thousand claims. More than sixty five thousand Indian citizens who returned from Kuwait have put claims for compensation.We have requested the compensation fund that the Smaller claims should be expeditiously disposed of. I am happy to inform the House that it has been agreed to. So, I do not want to say anything more at this stage except to assure the House that we are endeavoring to work out our foreign Policy as we have done before. With a renewed vigour under the leadership of the Prime Minister, who has been a very experienced and internationally known Foreign Minister, we are working

[Sh. Edurado Faleiro]

towards safeguarding and advancing our national interests. We are working towards establishing friendship, peace and cooperation among the countries of the world. I seek the support of this House in our endeavour and I look forward with great eagerness to their very valuable suggestions.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I beg to move:

That for the original motion the following be substituted namely:-

"This House, having considered tha present internationel situation, do find tha conduct of foraign policy by the Government of Indie as unsatisfactory, particularly in respect of :-

(a) Meeting the challenge of rapidly transforming intarnational scena;

(b) ineffective response te events preceding end following the Gulf Wer;

(c) response to the coup in USSR and its subsequent overturning by democratic forces in that country; and

(d) inability to counter Pakistan's interference in our internal effairs." (1)

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: Sir, I beg to move:

That for tha original motion, tha following be substitution namely:-

"This House, having considered the present international situation, expresses its dismay that the conduct of our external affairs has not been upto the mark particularly in respect of:-

(a) India's diminishing role as a front nation in the non-aligned Movament;

(b) its timely responses to fast happenings in different parts of the world; and

(c) Failura to met effectively anti-India propaganda by Pakistan." (2)

SHRI E. AHAMED: Sir, I beg to move:

3. That for the Original Motion, the following be substituted namely:-

"This House, having considered the present international situetion, recommends to Government te take immidiate necessary steps to realise adequate compensation to those Indian nationals who hed to flee to India from Kuwait and Iraq in the face of Gulf war."

[*Translation*]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this House has at last found an opportunity to discuss an important matter like international situation. It wes necessary that the House would have discuss the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs seriously. But it seems that we have not considered it seriously by sitting together to decide as to how should the work be decided during Budget session, what should be the priorities of the Debates and how best can the time of the House be utilised. We should taka some concrete decisions in this regard before the beginning of next Budget Session.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, international situation is changing fast. As the hon. Minister of State has said and I agree with him that the colonialism is almost finished. Apartheid is dying in South Africa and cold war has come to an end. Who had thought that the world-divided in tow groups - each committed to the pronounced objective of either ending or at least limiting each other's existence by their nuclear power would become a thing of past. Military alliance be it NATO or Warsaw pact have lost their utility. The great wall of Berlin does not exist any longer, Germany is unified and Namibia has attained independence. Soviet Union as called its military forces back from many regions. If credit for all these changas has to be given to any personality for all thesa epoch-making events it can undoubtedly be given to Shri Gorbachav of tha Soviet Union. Ha has become a personality of History. Ha has taken decision with graat couraga America has also contributed to all this. Both the Super powers have reelised that the war of Nucleer weapons should not be fought because it cannot be won. I term the process that has begun with this experience as an epoch-making event. But I do not agree to the view expressed by the Minister of State that a new era based on cooperation has begun. It is yet to make its debut. One era has certainly ended but the next has not yet begun. We are in the transition period.

While we feel happy over the developments in the world, these changes causes worry. We are going to face new challenges. America is talking of a new world order. We too want that the world is given a new shape, a new economic order but the signals from Washington show that since America has become the solitary super power, it would like to give a new shape to the world in its own way. I am apprehending the rise of a single super-alliance. It is not a super Power but unfortunately super-aliiance since the Soviet Union is becoming a junior partner in it due to its internal conflicts and financial problems.

This Super-ailiance consists of Euro-American Alliance taking with it the world Bank, IMF and multinational companies.

Where effort are made to give a particular shape to the world, the small countries and the weak countries would not have an oportunity to develop themselves in consonance with their own talent with their own nature and with their own culture. My fears become still grave when I heer from Washington that America is talking of asking the whole world to act as a moral force in accordance with what it dictates. How should then the small countries of the world-especially the third world countries-face the situation?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, India is a democratic country. Democracy has worked fairly well here leaving a short of span of 1975-76 apart. Many countrias in the West also claim to be democratic but think what sort of their behaviour has been when they had to choosa between the democracy in our country and the dictatorship in our neighbouring country; then their inclination has been towards the neighbouring country and not towards India. It is true that hey have given economic aid to us but they have supplied arms to our neighbours. Pakistan has become a nuclear power whereas we are under pressure to sign a non-proliferation treaty. We are not independent in expanding our missile science. It would be a matter of pleasure if the American policy is changed but sometimes I feel worried in view of their present attitude.

After attaining independence, our country decided to follow the policy of non-alignment. This was a decision in the right direction . I am sorry to say that while replying to the debate on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address the Prime Minister has said that there was no meeting ground between the Bharatia Janata Party and the Congress because the Bharatiya Janata Party is questioning the relevance of non-alignment. I myself have been a Minister of External Affairs. In 1977 when the Janata Government came into power we adhered to the policy of non-alignment but it should be genuine; end we followed it sincerely. Non-allignment was an extension of our independence in international sphere. India could not afford to commit a sin of playing a second fiddle to some world-power on the dawn of independence. I still remember it—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was also present in this House, who was the builder of our foreign-policy, I had submitted that after attaining independence India would have followed the same policy of not supporting any military alliance even if some other party than Congress could hava been in power or some other person than Pandit Nehru had been the Minister of External Affairs. We would

[Sh. Atal Vihari Bajpayee]

like to take our decision on international situation on its merits and demerits. But today the intentional scenario has changed so rapidly that non-aligned countries too would have to search new horizons. Where do exist opposite groups now? As I have pointed out just now that a new super-alliance is emerging. It wants to dominate politics, to dominate economy and to dominate culture. Under such circumstances the interests of the Third World countries be safe guarded and if non-aligned countries and non-align movement could be of any use. I do not have any objection. I am not demanding that India should alienate itself from the non-aiign movement. I am happy that the need to further strengthen the U.N.O was experienced at the conference held in Accra as the Minister of State has said so. I am reading out an excerpt from the Accra declaration:-

[*English*]

"The UN continued a Central Forum or the treatment of critical problems affecting humanity".

[*Translation*]

But we have seen at the time of Gulf war that how can the decisions be got taken with majority of Permanent members at the UN Assembly. It is true that Iraq ought not to have attacked Kuwait. Shri Saddam Hussain is our friend. Iraq has extended support to this country time and again on the Kashmir issue but it is an essence of the non-allignment policy that even if a friend commits a mistake one should make him realise it in a friendly manner. But Government did not do so.

15.00 hrs

America formed an alliance against it. Russia and China did not succeed much in their efforts though they tried to play diplomacy there. As such the democratisation of the UN is a must as the Minister of State has talked about it. The manifesto of the Bhartiya Janasangh states that the security Council should be extended and as such some countries like India, Brazil and any other African country should be inducted as member of the security council. The international politics does no longer remain the politics of balance of power. The politics of sphere of influence does not exist now. Now the Soviet Union is not there in the arena. Only one Superpower is there, single Godfather and it is essential to strengthen the United Nations Organisation so that it may work with restrain.

I remember that talks of improvement in the UN are going on. It is being said that if any decision between war and peace has to be taken, the permanent members of the Security Council have veto power. They can take a decision. They can reject any decision also. But in the cases where United Nations Organisation it self has to initiate some military action then the decision of the Security Council alone should not suffice. That must be taken in the General Assembly. I would like the Indian delegation Participating in the session of the General Assembly beginning today to ensure whether world opinion can be mobilised in this regard. Some one might say that if this matter is to be taken to the General Assembly it would take much time. Immediate action would be necessary. But the meeting of the General Assembly can be called within twenty four hours. Even if there is any other suggestion, we should consider it. But all the decisions cannot be left to handful of nations in view of the changing international situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the meeting of the general assembly is being held today and our Minister of External Affairs has gone there to participate in it. I have a suspicion that attempt will be made to raise the Kashmir issue there. By a phone-call from New-York yesterday. I have come to know that a member has been taken in the US delegation who is well-known for his anti-India view.

15.03 hrs

[MR.SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

He hails from Indiana. He has been associated openly with pro-Khalistani and pro-Pakistani lobbies. If they follow the policy announced by America as a member of American Representative Council, it would be different, moreover I have observed that the policy of Washington has become somewhat clear. All the same, pakistani lobby is functioning actively in America, Pakistanis, who have settled in the United Kingdom are trying to influence the Members of House of Commons representing their area.

Very recently, a shadow Foreign Minister from the Labour Party had arrived here. What was discussed with him, is not known to us. We lag behind in this diplomatic race. Our embassies have to function more actively in such cases. The Indians settled abroad have to function more devotedly and they shall have to take inspiration to take interest in such affairs. At times it is felt that our embassies abroad are not in contact with our people there.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the international scenario is fast changing. May I know, whether the Government of India the External Affairs Ministry, where the diplomacy is formulated, and our embassies where the diplomacy is being executed are able to cope up with such a changing situation? If the developments in the gulf are any indication of it we feel that we are lagging behind and we have lost the control over the situation. One might say that there was political instability and an atmosphere of elections in Delhi during the Gulf war. Agreed, it was an atmosphere of elections. All the same, was it necessary to make the Gulf war a part of our domestic politics? It was not and it should never be. But we could not make a correct calculation about the situation.

We could not guess exactly the change that took place in the Soviet Union, when Gorbachev was deposed, and this dramatic return to power within 72 hours. I do not hesitate to believe that on the basis of the limited information that I had, I could guess that Gorbachev is also being led towards the same path which Khrushohev once tread. In the beginning it was felt that if party, Defence Forces and K.G.B. join together, the chapter of Glassnost and Perestroika will come to an end, but later on it was discovered that Gorbachev took his men with himself, brought his party into confidence, even in K.G.B. and in army also there were certain elements favouring the change who came out on the roads. Could we make a right guess in this direction? Whether we say anything about that change or not, is a different question altogether. The Minister of State has said that it is their internal problem, let them find a solution themselves. If they would have not said so, it would hardly make any difference, but why was our calculation wrong? Is it not the failure of the embassy? Many Indians are living in Moscow, moreover there are various organisations, many intellectuals and other organisations of the world. Why at all, we were not able to make a right calculation as to how deep Gorbachev had gone into the process of change?

Similar was the situation in case of Gulf war. We were not able to make a right calculation whether America would plunge into the war or not. I remember when President Saddam stood for the war people were saying that Iraq is going to be the new Vietnam for America. Neither could we understand Vietnam nor did we make a clear assessment of Iraq, in case of America we under estimated their strength who could frame alliance for the first time after the world war, which was a confederation of 27 countries including the non-aligned countries. That is why we are worried about the non-aligned movement. India is a founder-member. What about Yogoslavia? It is disintegrating. It is not in a position to play a meaningful role. Egypt is in favour of joining of 77 countries more. It was decided to form a co-ordinating committee. Indonesia is not taking any interest. I feel that it is necessary that the non-aligned and other countries of the third world shall have combine, not with a view to form a third block. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you might be knowing that while talking about the non-aligned movement Pandit Nehru had also said that we are not going to form any third block for India. India was not

[Sh. Atal Vihari Bajpayee]

ready even for the formation of a secretariat. Pandit Nehru said that he did not want to institutionalise the movement. We should have independence of though and deed. But with the passage of time there were difficulties as the non-aligned countries joined the movament.

A fresh initiative is required now. We are in favour of a world based on co-operation all the same the world, is full of diversity. Every country should decide its own fate. India should hava a single integrated global market. Should there be similar shops in the whole world? Whether the commodities available from these shops would be the same or the sales girls would be the seme. Please excuse ma it is not the concept a universal brotharhood. If we work with a sense of belonging, a feeling as if we belong to a single family, although we would follow our individual style of functioning. We want to maintain tha diversity and pluralism and you know the communism has been defeated, because it has come down from a world of thought into a world of ism. Such e systam has restricted all walks of life. With the result independence has gone out. If damocracy would continue (Survive) it would keep on changing as it is a quality of democratic countries, because of the strength and energy they possess If dictatorship would not have amerged in the garb of the dictatorship of the prodetanat the basis of the philosophy on which Russia emerged into a super power was enough to mesmerise the world, but it disintegrated in the same manner as it came into existence.....

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): The philosophy of life will remain.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The philosophy of life will remain, but when the philosophy takes the form of 'ism' its decline starts. There have been enough of "isms" we don't want any further ism. Lifa can be wedded to any ism. There are two things which are to be considered. Man cannot compromise his independence for ever. Secondly the progress of humanity, the progress of the universe is possible only when man is made the centre of attention and not by neglecting him or making him an ordinary part of a big machinery. But, on the other hand, there is a possibility of some danger also. I am pointing to that because communism and capitalism are opposite to each other but the nature of both is the same. Both are interest in dominating end taking the fullest advantage. It is true that there is an aspect of social justice in communism but capitalism favours democracy. India wants to move ahead by coordinating both......

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHAUDHURY: There should be a national Government.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Comrade is worried.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I agree with the Minister of State that we should improve our relations with the neighbouring countries and strengthen SAARC. The Prime Minister of China is coming here and we should endeavour for normelising our relations with China. There is the border problem also, we should find a suitable solution of that problem also. Our relations should improve and in this context I believe that the whole House and the whole country ere of the same opinion.

So far as Pakisten is concerned, in spite of our endeavours it is not heading towards friendship. We should be ready and prepared, we ehould strengthen ourself and we should always try to bring home Pakistan and should impress upon her that none of the efforts to divide India would be successful. If the President of Pakistan is claiming kashmir saying that it comes under unfinished agenda of Partition, it means that Pakistan has not accepted the partition of the country. They are trying to extend their boundaries which will not be tolerated. If there can be a solution about Siachen it would be all the more better. Pakistan should try to understand the futility of posting its army at such heights, because these armies are not serving any purpose at all. But the friendly countries of Pakistan should try to pressurise Pakistan. I said in the beginning that they are not applying any pressure. Perhaps Washington may adopt a different policy, now. I read in the newspapers today, that India is also being dragged into the proposals about atomic power which the Senate and Congress wanted to apply to Pakistan. It is not good.

AN HON. MEMBER: It has been rejected.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It has been rejected. That is good. But there are certain such forces, such alements which want to maintain a parity between India and Pakistan. We are in favour of friendship.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would suggest that we should make some plans on the basis of environment. That would be highly beneficial. For example, if Nepal is prepared we will send 500 youths both boys and girls of Nepal for a year or two to plant trees there is the territory of Nepal. We would bear the expenses. We would send these youths there voluntarily. There is continuous felling of trees, the rivers are full of sand and earth. Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are facing floods. Our relations with Nepal have improved. There is democracy in Nepal. I am citing an example of plantation. May I know whether any such positive measure can be taken? Whether this-co-operation would be really implemented? Its implementation should not be record alone, but it should be done practically- in letter and spirit. It should not remain on files alone.

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): Like Karnali.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Like Karnal and Pancheshwar. We can generate electricity. we can help them while we would help ourselves. But an atmosphere of mutual friendship and confidence required for it was lacking so far, but now it is created again. It is very important to take some positive measures in this direction.

The hon. Minister has mentioned about West Asia. I agree that Israel should vacate the territory of the Arabs it has forcibly occupied. A separate and Independent Palestinian State should come into existence.. The palestinians are roaming about without a homeland. They have become refugees. There is some change in tha attitude of PLO. Now there is a proposal to hold an International Conference on West Asia. This Conference should be held at the earliest. It is a must to find out a solution to this vexed problem. If this is not done, there is likelihood of the entire world getting involved in another war like that of the Gulf war.

So far as Israel is concerned, India has already granted its recognition to Israel, but does not have any diplomatic relations with it. The Government should think over it. For the time being, we can allow them to open an office of Consulate General in Delhi. To day that this would lead to antagonishing our Arab friends does not hold good. There are many countries in the world who have friendly relations with the countries on both sides and that is one should not be allowed to be linked with the internal affairs of our country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there has always been a concensus on the foreign policy and that must be. The primary aim of the foreign policy is to safeguard tha national interests. With the change in Government there can be a change in the perception or the emphasis but the basic assessment about national interests would remain the same. Therefore, it is essential that the Government should continue to exchange views. Besides, concrete steps should be taken by the Government for formulating policies as well as in its procedure. There was a Planning Committee. I do not know what happened to that? Who is advising the government? We have very good officers in the Ministry of External Affairs, but at the same time views must be exchanged with the experts, intellectuals, Research Institutes, Universities and opposition parties. You would excuse me when I say that the Consultative Committee is not capable of doing this work. You will have to set up a separate forum for it and this

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

should be a continued process.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is of utmost importance that India plays a positive role in the changing world. It is true that we are facing a crisis within the country and it is also true that we are seeking loans. The hon. Finance Minister mentioned a harsh reality in his speech that those countries seeking loans also cannot play a more effective role in the field of foreign policy. Here I differ from him. When we got freedom neither we had sufficient assets nor a big Army. We had only moral courage. We formulated a foreign policy based on justice, equality and freedom that lead us to win honour in the world. 'NAM' brought us laurels. How much we achieved through NAM is a different matter, but NAM brought us good name. Today, the country, has to play a significant role in the world and therefore, I would like that on the Ministry of External Affairs and the diplomats should sincerely shoulder their responsibilities.

With these words, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

[*English*]

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy that ultimately at the fag end of the Session, we have found time to discuss the present international situation. The Minister of State for external Affairs has abley taken the review of the global changes and the different steps the Government had taken and the various reactions the Government had given at various points. I have also listened very attentively to the ex-External Affairs 'Minister' Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. I was also impressed by several views he had expressed. Of course, I do not agree with some of the observations made by him to which I would like to come later on.

It is a well-know fact that outstanding global changes have taken in the recent past. Mr. Gorbachov through his glasnost and perestroika had first dismantled the Soviet Empire and six countries in Eastern and Central Europe were released. Now, thereafter, from time to time, different steps which he took ultimately have resulted in great revolution and reform even though it has resulted in disintegration of the Soviet Union to some extent. There is also an attempt to keep these States together on certain subjects at least. Therefore, this new development has to be taken note of that several independent States are coming into existence. Upto-now we were dealing with the Soviet Union as such. Now, we will have to deal with these different States, particularly Baltic States also. And I am very happy that our Government has taken in this direction proper steps and there was also visit of Uzebekistan President. He had also signed agreements with India on economic and commercial technology on 17 August, 1991. We have also recognised the Baltic States as they have been recognised by several other countries. In a short time, we shall have to watch the further developments regarding the Soviet Union and the other States which are slowly becoming independent and sovereign.

A criticism has been levelled in the form of this alternative Resolution and there was some indication in the speech of Atalji also that how is it that we have not assessed that the coup that had taken place on 19th of August would be short-lived and Mr. Gorbachov would come back to power. From that point of view, it is alleged at some point that our reaction at that time was not in consonance with our past friendship with Comrade Gorbachov and also not in consonance with our principles of democracy. I would humbly submit that these observations are in the sort of becoming wiser after the events. Nobody could have assessed on 19th of August or, as a matter of fact, on 20th of August that that coup which had deposed Gorbachov would certainly fail and it would last for more than seventy-two hours. The situation was so confusing that nobody could have assessed the further events. Therefore, from that point of view, the cautious reaction of our Government was quite proper.

The Minister in the House itself had stated that the Government has seen the statement signed by Mr. G.I. Yanayev, the acting soviet President, Prime Minister pavlov and the First Deputy Chairman of the soviet defence Council Baklanov that in accordance with article 127.7 of the Soviet Constitution, the authority of the President of the USSR, has been transferred from Mr. Gorbachov to the Vice-President. Therefore, we had said here that we were carefully and constantly monitoring the situation. Events in Soviet Union were of Vital interest to us and indeed to the whole world. I submit that this was the proper reaction in that particular situation.

A country cannot be wedded to any particular leader, it can be wedded to the sovereign power of that country. whatever the people do in that country has to be ultimately respected The real foreign policy of a Government would be to recognise. the duly constituted Government in that country, whoever might be the leader. Whatever may be the form of Government, we have never formed our foreign policy on this basis that if there is democracy in that country, so, we should have good relations or nearer relations. Whether it is democracy or dictatorship or whatever form it is, always the tact of the foreign policy is that you recognise the legally constituted Government which is constituted by the people of that country, in whatever form they like. Therefore, my submission is that the reaction on that day made by this Government was absolutely proper, cautious and according to all rules of international law. We are now saying that we should have assessed that ultimately Gorbachev will come back and he was a friend or our, and, therefore, we should have supported him , etc. I think that is not a good criticism as far as this Government is concerned. Mr. Gorbachev himself had written a letter to our Prime Minister profusely thanking the Government for the support they have given. He has said:

> "I am grateful to you for the firm stand the leadership of India and you have personally taken in regard to the attempted putsch".

This is the extract the letter which has ben written by Gorbachev to our Prime Minister. Therefore, there is no bitterness as far as the present Government is concerned. We were entitled to give the reaction which we have given and, therefore, we also entitled to support the present Government which has come into existence under the leadership of Gorbachev and also Boris Yelstin.

It may be that in the days to come also, Gorbachev will lead the Soviet Union even though, as some feel that Boris Yelstin is going to be more powerful as far as that country is concerned. Of course, we are not concerned with the internal struggle for leadership in that country. But, I feel that ultimately Gorbachev is going to be, as the matter stands at present, the elder political leader and after the presidential elections, perhaps, he will head a loose ceremonial federation; but would emerge as father-figure of the Soviet Union. From this point of view, we should deal with the new emerging situation there. I say it is necessary to deal with all these sovereign States or independent States which are emerging out of this situation, in the same manner as we were dealing with the Soviet Union. We should, therefore, establish political and commercial contacts with these new countries and follow absolutely what is happening there and try to safeguard our long-range interests.

It is true that because of all these events, a uni-polar world has come into existence. We shall have to take notice of that uni-polar world also. But, that does not men that the Non-aligned Movement has no relevance in the present situation. What I feel is that the No-aligned Movement was not at all any negative slogan. It was not merely a response to the cold war between the two Super Powers. But it was a positive slogan of having political independence, economic independence of all the developing countries, the newly emerging countries without being slaves of the foreign or economic policy of any other super power.

Therefore, form that point of view I say that even if the cold war has ended, perhaps,

[Sh. Sharad Dighe]

the disarmament is also in the proper direction. We shall have to nourish and lead, as far as possible, ths Non-aligned Movament as it has still got relevance and it is still necessary to lead this Movement and strengthen it.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the former Foreign Minister, has also spoken about democratisation of the United Nations Organisation today. In order to achieve that objective also I feel that this NAM will hava to be strenthaned further and from that point of view we shall hava to go ahead. It is good that the suggestion to re-nama this No-Aligned Movement has not been accepted, it has been rejected recently in that Maeting. And it was also, I think, suggested to merga Non-Aligned Movement with some other bodies and that proposal has also been rejected by the majority of the people. So, from this point of view we shall go ahead and still stick on to the No-Aligned Movament with the sama vigour with which we hed been pursuing up till now.

Now, Sir, the main point which is emerging in the present global change is that military blocs are being replaced by the trading and commercial blocs. We shall hava to take account of that new situation. Formerly Big Powers were interested in capturing countries, but now they are no longer interested in retaining the domination over any country from the military point of view. They are more interested in capturing markets and tharefore, differant commercial blocs are being formed. On the one side we see France and Germany coming togethar. Several other commercial blocs are being formed and from that point of view now our foraign policy also should be oriented towards the commercial and trading interests of this country. Therefore, from that point of view I feel that SAARC would be a very necessary organisation for tha purpose of interest in trade, commerce, science and technology of this country. SAARC is an organisation where we are playing a good role and just now the Minister has said that the King of Bhutan has recently visited our country. Now, President Gayoom, Chairman of SAARC, has also visited, and Sir Lanka is hosting the next SAARC Conference and they have been also keeping good contact with India.

The most irritant point is Pakistan. Pakistan and India are the biggest countries in this organisation, SAARC, and unless the relations between Pakistan and India are improved, it will be difficult to fulfil the purpose of the SAARC, according to my humble view.

The main hurdles are that Pakistan has been always shifting its stand. The pious pronouncements are always that 'we are not interfering with any Indien politics' They always deny that they are helping the terrorists in Punjab and Keshmir, but in fact evidence is always found thet they are vary much helping these terrorists. That is the greatest irritent es far as the relations between two countries ere concerned. The Special Envoy of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Foreign Secretary Sharyar Khan, said ebout the opening of e new chapter. But Immediately after thet, when the Meeting if NAM at Accra took plece, he immediately raised the issue of Kashmir there. Therefore, it has become very difficult for Indie to take the proper stend. As far as pakisten is concerned, it is most upredictable, talking in double tongue. Therefore, it has become very difficult to deal with this country, and for the relationship between India and Pakistan, much depends upon the success of the SAARC Conference. From this point of view, a full end proper stretegy will heve to be found out to meet this situation. As far as the campaign of disinformation on Kashmir issue is concerned, we have to take more care. The debate in the House of Commons also shows that meny of the MPs had expressed views in favour of Pakistan. I was only the Government which supported our stand end said that issue should be solved bilaterally and within the framework of Simla Agreement. When I read the whole debate, I found that not only the Conservatives, but the Labour MPs also expressed views much against India's stand on Kashmir. That was immediataly experienced by us whan the Shadow Foreign Minister of Graat Britain Mr. kaufman visited this country and Pakistan and mada certain statamants. Therefore, I submit that the Government should take mora care as far as this campaign of disinformation is concerned. Otherwise, even though it is a good causa, it is iikely to be misundarstood throughout the world. We have to take much more cara on this issue.

Than, as far as China is concerned, our late Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi had broken the ice in December, 1988 by visiting that country and now the visit of their Prime Minister is also due. i feel the relationship between these two big countries will also improve and a long standing dispute may also come to an end.

As far as the Gulf crisis is concerned, India hed clearly end consistently repudiated aggression and called for Iraq's full and unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait. Our Govememt had also supported and complied with all the resolutions of the UN Security Council in the matter, including resolution No. 661 which imposed economic sanctions against Iraq. It has also ben stated now that neerly 30,000 of our nationals have since gone back and the Government is also trying to get suitable compensation at an early date for the Indian returnees. The Government should pursue this hereafter also. Therefor, some more vigilance is necessary in certain areas. But as far as the general structure is concerned, I feel that the Government is alert and is following the proper policy and is reacting properly to the global events which have taken place from tima to time.

15.44 hrs.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir the House is discussing the international situation at a time when the world is passing through a period of historic importance and phenomenal changes. The Cold War era is over and the two Super Powers instead of confronting each other on politics, economics and ideology, they are now trying to understand each other and at least find some common ground to work together. Now the danger of annihilation of humanity has considerably continuously threatened after tha II World War, when these two superpowers have entered into an arms race. Of course, the imperialist power, the colonial powers led by the United States of America was not able to understand the emergence of a new world, they did not fully appreciate that a new world awakening had come after the II World War and when most of the countries were becoming free U.S.A. Block was working with a view to dominates dominating the entire world. They were trying to prevent the march of new humanity which was born after the II World War. The soviet Union and the other socialist countries were also being threatened. They did not develop the confidence that there would be a common ground for understanding and cooperation. Tha real problem, in my opinion, was the lack of trust. Mistrust was the main cause of confrontation which helped the arms rece to develop in the entire world. It was an era when they newly liberated countries were trying to develop their economy were trying to solve their basic problems of poverty, unemployment, removal of social-economic disparity. They were trying to find peaceful era to mobilise their resources to meet the challenges of the day-to-day life.

When they were confronting in that background, No-Aligned Movement emerged and played a historic role. I agree with Shri Atal Bihari Vajapayeeji that it is not only tha economic strength which gives a country a strength to play its role in the international arena but also its perception and ideals India itself was a poor country. We were struggling with our economic problems. But we had tha perception of a new emerging world; we had an imagination that what kind of world should be built. We thought rightly that the imperialism had to be defeated, colonialism should not be allowed to dominate and interfere in with the internal affairs of another country. Therefore, we played a historic role by bringing all the newly liberated countries in the Non-aligned Movement and realised certain issues. Though we were misunderstood in

[Sh. Chandrajeet Yadav]

the beginning but ultimately the Non-Aligned Movement was accepted by all powers, Its relevance, its tole and the ideas, its objectives which were projected.

We are very happy that the arms race is lessening. We are happy that for the first time after the II World War, certain important measures have been taken for reduction of some strategic arms. There has been an understanding reached between the two supperpowers that war is no solution and nuclear confrontation will lead/to total annihilating of the world. Even the United States of America whose leaders used to talk of limited nuclear war, has to understand the danger of nuclear confrontation. This is a major break through in the international relationship. Mr. Gorbachev, no doubt, has played a historic role. He will always be remembered in history. He may fail in the management of his country's internal economic, administrative and political problems. History will give its verdict about that. But there cannot be two opinions about the role which he played in removing the mis-trust between the two Super Powers, in restoring the confidence in each other and in coming to the negotiating table and discussing the world problems threadbare. He will be remembered as a great peace maker. He will be remembered as a great man who made contributions in changing the total map of the world. But the other things are also emerging. I will not say that the United States of America has become the only Super Power. Maybe, today it may look like that. But we cannot also undermine the emergence of other countries, other powers in the world. I feel even today that with the collective wisdom of the newly liberated countries, the Non-Aligned world has still got a great relevance. It has a great role to play. There are internal problems. But the No-Aligned countries have to solve those problems and they have to look at things with a new perception. They have to think what kind of world they are going to build.

Sir, I think Germany has emerged as a united Germany. It is a big power today. It is, at lest, a major economic power. Japan, in Asia, is a power to be reckoned with. France is playing its own role in the European Community as well as in world politics. In spite of our internal problems, India and China will remain powers In the world. In spite of our economic weakness, we will remain so. We never thought that millitary power is the real power. India has its own message to give to the whole world. We never looked towards the Soviet Union or the United States of America just because therewere major military powers. Though we are not an economic power, yet we have a message of peace, we have a message of cooperation. Our leaders played a historic role and made their historic contributions in the liberation of the entire Third World. Gandhiji himself, only with his philosophy, with his commitment, to the service of humanity only with the help of the Indian people, challenged the biggest imperialist power on the earth. We did not have a big Army. We did not believe even in violence and we did not liberate ourselves with the help any guerilla war or with any Armed forces. But the ideas, the philosophy, and the ideals played their role. I think India must continue with that and it has to play that role to give a new perception, to give a new direction to the world. I think that is the real challenge which our Ministry of External Affairs must very seriously think of. It must think of what kind of a role we are gong to play in the emerging world.

I find that there is a sense of fear prevailing in many countries of the Third World after the internal situation of the soviet Union. What will happen to Cuba? What will happen to the Middle-East countries where, after the Gulf War, the Americans have gone in a big way?

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): What will happen to India?

SHRI CHANDR JEET YADAV: I am not so much frightened about India. India has got its won strength and Indian people have faced many serious challenges. Therefore, there is no threat to India. In a country like ours, problems will always be there. So, an atmosphere of fear, an atmosphere of diffidence is being created in the countries of the Third World. I think, here comes the role of India. It is not that you have made a very big contribution in Accra making a proposition that the Security Council should be expanded and U.N.O should be democratised and a few more nations should go and join the Security Council. If you are taking a big credit fo that that you are playing that is not that important. Let us accept this that after the New Delhi Non-Alignment summit, the message has gone to the whole world that the role of non-alignment is diminishing day by day. That is the real challenge. How the non-aligned countries are going to take collective decision? How are they going to play their role ? What role are we going to pay in the South-South Cooperation? What are we going to do in a situation where there should be North-South cooperation? Certain decisions were taken. But they did not materialise. It rather they lpsed. I will request the External Affairs Ministry that India should go to the next Non-alignment Conference with a comprehensive programme . Before that, necessary work should be done Pandit jawaharlal Nehru used to talk about the emergence of Asian personality'. Where is the Asian personality today? I will say that we should also try to see whether there is a possibility — If Germany comes and joins the Non-Alignment as an observer—of china also coming and joining as an observer in the Non-alignment Movement. It is not enough for us to pay compliments that China and India have now removed some of their misunderstanding. We should make a deliberate attempt, we should take initiative efforts so that India and China should be able to take jointly certain initiatives to bring the Asian countries together. I will rather suggest that not only the SAARC by the ASEAN countries also should come together. Why not there can be some kind or cooperation of coordination between the SAARC countries and the ASEAN countries. We must explore the possibilities of the these things also, so that this sould be done.

I must say that as an Indian, my pride is hurt. When we could see India was playing a great role whether it was Bandung, whether it was Non-Alignment, whether it was the ASIAN Conference or whether Indian's path being accepted as a mediator on many difficult Problems of the world, I find where is India today in Combodia, where is India today in Afghanistan, where was India when the south African Yeal upires emerged, where was India when Namibia became free where is India which has been supporting Arab countries against Isreali's aggression and when there is initiative being taken at he Middle East conference to solve this problem, where is India? This hurts my pride as an Indian that the role of India today is not seen anywhere in the world. That is one big challenge and India has to do a little more of heart-searching as to why it is happening like this. I think, India has not responded timely on many international issues. That has also given us a big set back.

When Iraq attacked Kuwait. Iraq is a member of the Non-Alligned Movement and Kuwait is also member of the Non-Alignment Movement. This means, one Non-Alignment country attacked the other Non-Alignment country. At this time, India has waited for some time and said in a very persuasive and mild manner that we hope that Iraq will withdraw its forces and there will be some peasceful solution.

16.00 hrs.

There should not have been any hesitation in out right condemnation of Iraq, inspite of the fact that Iraq was our friend. India should never deviate from its principal position, from the position of ideals. Iraq had totally grabbed Kuwait and we left the whole thing to the United States of America. The United States of America had created a public opinion and got 27 countries on their side and became the meditator and saviour of a small country like Kuwait. India was totally absent from this scene. This was something which was very serious lapses. We must very seriously think as to why this kind of a major lapse had been committed?

[Sh. Chandrajeet Yadav]

16.01 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

what happened in our friendly country - Soviet Union? In the Soviet Union when Mr. Gorbachev, who is a great friend of India, was detained, Mr. Bush was making hectic efforts at least to anquire about the whereabouts of Mr. Gorbachav, about his iife, about his haalth. But, India had kept quiet. We did not evan show tha courtasy of phoning to Moscow to know as to how Mr. Gorbachav was. Tha first reaction of our Prime Minister was very unfortunata. Whan Mr. Gorabchev was dethroned and when there was a thraat to his life, the Prime Minister had said that leaders of every country, without giving a serious throughout, should not bring about any major changes. What did it convey? The message was conveyed that Mr. Gorbachav was wrong and he committed a mistake, whan he brought changes in Soviet Union which were responsibie for this situation and for his datention in Crimea and coup.

I would like to know from the Foreign Minister, though I know that he cannot give an answer here in this House, as to what reaily did tha Indian Ambassador report at that particular time. I am told that he sent totally a wrong report which was based entirely on a wrong assessment. I have already stated in this House that in his report, he made a request to the Defence Minister of India saying that he should congratuaiate and send greetings to the Defence Minister of new coup leader. It is because he said that the Army was very powerful in the Soviet Union,and it has come to stay. Therefore, we should not say anyting which will antagonize the leaders of the coup. Is it tha right kind of response from a country like India which committed itself to certain ideals and certain objectives? I think, this kind of Under brings down our prestige in the international arena.

I will say that now we have entered into a new era. It may not be an era of complete cooperation, world has not yet reached that stage. But, it is an era of reajustment in international relationships. We cannot close our eyes and say that that is an enemy camp and anothers is a camp of our friends. The entire international relationships are being restructured. It is because the whole world has entered into a new kind of era. Therefore, India must start taking initiative right now and should talk to certain Asian countries, certain European countries who are friendly to us. I think we should pay special attention to that . We have not paid anough attention to develop pour rtelationships with France, Germany and Japan, and as is said earlier, specially with China. I think it is a matter of great satifaction that United Natons Organisation is playing a laudable role. It is good that India has always supported it, even when the United Nations was under great attack from United States of America, UK and some other countries. At that time India stood by United Nations. That has proved correct that support to United Nations is important.

I think we should take note of the move at Accra that the security Council should be restructured, that it should be expended and that its entire role should be reviewed. What should be the role of the Security council? How should it be restructured? What representation will be there not only of one or two countries, but how the non-aligned countries would be represented in that movement? I think this is an initiative which has been taken at a right time. It should be properly pursued. India must start seriously talking to some of the non-aligned countries and also some of the European countries. I am sure that we will be able to get support on this issue from many countries.

So far as SAARC is concerned, I say that it is not still taking off properly. There is lack of dynamism, lack of proper coordination. I know that India has its own problems because of the obstructing role of pakistan even in SSARC. Even in SAARC, a small organisation, India gets isolated. We should be very careful about these things. India should make every move with a proper understanding and with proper relationship. No move should be made without creating the proper atmosphere for it.

When you made an observation about the neighbouring countries, it is all right. You said that our priority should be to develop our relations with the neighbouring countries. But I will bring to your notice one very important observation of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on this. It has to be done always in the world perspective. Panditji said in one of his speeches that our neighbours now are all the countries of the world. Because the world is becoming small because of the development of communications, space, science and technology and everything. Therefore he said our neighbours now are all the countries of the world, so that we cannot relate our foreign policy just to a few countries around us; but have to think of practically every country in the world and take into consideration of the possible areas of conflict, trade, economic interest,etc. It has been recognised now that if there is a conflict of a big scale anywhere in the world, it is bound to spread all over the world that war has become indivisible and therefore peace is also indivisible. I wanted to only emphasize this. Sometimes I hear the voice in our country as if we have nothing to do with the world; we should only look towards our neighbouring countries and try to develop our relations with them. May be you take a certain stand on the world situation and some of the neighbouring countries do not support you in that. It does not mean that you should not take initiative at the world level at all.

Therefore while developing our relations with the neighbouring countries, we should never forget that a new world is emerging and our relationship with other countries has also to be developed.

I will say that we should also very seriously consider whether there is any possibility-I have said about some kind of coordination between SAARC and ASEAN of developing what we call the Asian personality or any kind of from like Asian Coordination Forum. Europeans are talking of Common European Home. They have taken many initiatives. Now, they have one parliament; they have one economic organisaion; they are talking of having oneness. Even France has proposed one European Government. On the one hand, these developed countries are trying to unite and sort out their differences within their own organisation; they are trying to move collectively; they are emerging as united countries. But, on the other hand, whan there is need for greater unity amongst the newly liberated countries-the third world countries—we are trying to fight with each other and we are giving an image of conflicting with each other on major issues. I feel that India must move along with some other countries. When moving along with some other countries, I seethe possibility of having some joint initiative with China and may be to some limited extent with Japan also. But, there is a definate possibility. I have visited China two or three times in the past two, there years. Once they told us very clearly that they would like to have a joint seminar with India, at least to see what can we do together, how can we move jointly in matters of economic cooperation. In all these matters, the Government of India should explore the possibilities very seriously. We should not wait and say, Let the initiative come from china'? Why should that initiative come from China? Why should we not take initiative from our side? Therefore, I would like our External Affairs Ministry to pay greater attention to this aspect.

There is a danger of United States of America dictating to the whole world. What we find today is that America has totally assumed to itself a new role telling Soviet Union that these are the five points; you must accept that; and only then we will give you help. When three newly appointed Baltic Foreign Ministers went to the White House, Mr. Bush told them, "Look here, my country will not be able to help you, unless you ring these political reforms, administrative reforms, modifications in the approach in international arena, the role in new Europe. " There is a serious danger in this kind of role. How to prevent it? Our country is also making efforts in improving the relations with the

[Sh. Chandrajeet Yadav]

United States of America. Nobody will oppose that. But at the same time, India will never accept and should never accept if one single country dictates in a manner as if it has become the single sole world power, to know the interests of other countries. It is a very clear interference in the internal and domestic affairs of other countries. This tendency must be stopped and for this India must give a serious thought as to how to take care of this.

The last point I would like to say is that, we have to take care of the world public opinion. World public opinion also plays a very important role. We must know that American public opinion played a big role when? America committed aggression and was killing barbarously the people of vietnam. World public opinion inside America played a major role there. We know how the Public opinion emerged there. We are talking of the end of cold war era and emerging of a new era.

Many people from all over the world have been meeting and taking collective initiatives to contribute to the world peace. Therefore, the public opinion also plays a very important role, a meaningful role in building a new kind of relationship. I am glad that our External Affairs Ministry has been taking care of this. And we succeeded in this country at least on many major issues that our foreign policy and many tenets of our foreign policy became the nationally accepted issues. I think, that initiative should not be lost. That should continue. We should not think that there is no need because the arms race is not there, we have entered into another era, and therefore, there is no need of public opinion. My emphasis is that we should pay necessary attention to cultivate public opinion in favour of peace, in favour of a new world based on justice, equality, brotherhood and human dignity.

I find today there is a talk of one world order. Perhaps we have very quietly given up our objective of a new international economic order. I think, there is a need today - much more today than any time - that India must continue with that initiative, India must fight that new struggle, that we want a new international socio-economic order based on justice, based on equality, based on human dignity where the exploiting nations and powerful nations should not be able to put any kind of pressure on the smaller nations.

Then, I will say that for some time we are not hearing about the Indian Ocean as the zone of peace. What has happened to that initiative? United States of America was always creating problems. They were preventing. They have prevented for the last ten years successfully and did not allow a conference to be held at Colombo for Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. I think, we should take it up again and we should see that this conference takes place.

I hope that our Foreign Ministry would also pay a little more attention on our external publicity. We get a feeling that Pakistan is doing much better than us in external propaganda in misleading public opinion and also raising continuously - during the last few years they have rather tried to raise aggressively - the question of Kashmir on international fora. Therefore, necessary steps should be taken to meet this kind of propaganda which Pakistan is trying to make in a very aggressive manner. We should take care on that front also. I am sure that in the new international situation, India will not lack in initiative, India will not give up the path of collective movement with other Non Alignment Movement countries, and India will make its contribution in keeping with our great tradition our great historical values, that the world becomes a better world, it becomes a world of peace, it becomes a world where there will be no poverty, it becomes a world where there will be no threat by one country, one powerful nation, against another nation. With these words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Chairman, the scope of this discussion is, of course, very wide, very large. It is not possible in this limited time to try to touch on all the various problems and various aspects of the international scenario as we see it today. Therefore, I will try to limit myself to only one or two themes, if I may say so. That does not mean that I do not have anything to say on many other questions that have already been raised here by many speakers. But there is, after all, paucity of time. I agree with the Minister that the main thing is that we are practically in a new world. The world is not only changing but it has already changed. And for a country like India, to try to find its bearings in this new world and to chalk out what its path should be, is not an easy task. I agree with this point. It requires much more discussion and interaction between different opinions and different viewpoints. That is one reason why we, in the Opposition, were very unhappy about the way in which the discussion on international situation was treated in this Session, as though it is a matter of secondary importance and can be relegated to the last day of the Session and even that was doubtful at one stage. And now, you can see the situation here. The House is practically defunct already. This is not the way to deal with this question, if you are serious about it. We were not able to take up the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of External Affairs. I do not think this has ever happened before in the Budget Session. But we are creating new records, I think, of the wrong sort.

Now, I only want to say or at least, I want to concern myself with the few remarks that I made on the question of our country's role. What has been India's role and what should be India's role now? We were not just one of the Non-aligned countries or just one of the Third World countries. We were something more than that. I do not say this in any spirit of boasting or anything. After all, India had occupied a special place in the whole community of Third World countries and Non-Aligned countries and we were a crusader from the very beginning. From the dawn of Independence, this country was a crusader for certain principles which have been mentioned here by many of my friends and for which we fought relentlessly and for which we mobilised support relentlessly all over the world, that is, principles of peace, disarmament, nonviolence, cooperation, anti-colonialism and anti-racism. On all these issues, India was a crusader in a world In which we were economically not a strong power but much weaker than we are today, I suppose. I must remind the House that from the very beginning, we did enjoy the support, the sympathy and solidarity of what used to be known as the Second World. All socialist countries cannot yet be described as former socialist countries. Some of them are still there. Anyway, one cannot deny the fact that a country like India and other Third World countries were in difficulties when they had to face some crisis in the international arena, when they were sought to be pressurised by stronger forces, sought to be blackmailed sometimes, when the question of giving them developmental aid for their progress came up, etc. Very often, we were in difficulties, which we did overcome, no doubt, on the basis of our own strength. But we had the unstinted support always of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in that regard. Even in the Security Council, we know as to how many times they stood by us when were in danger of being isolated by powers like the United States, United Kingdom and all that and also on the issue of Kashmir, Goa or any other of these issues. That world, I am afraid, has gone. At least it has weakened and very much marginalised. They are no longer in a position, for whatever reason, to stand by us in that same way. Some people in our country, some circles of course, are happy. They are gloating over the fact that according to them the so called Socialist World has collapsed, socialism is dead, socialism has been rejected and nobody wants socialism now. I can understand America or some other powerful Western capitalist countries saying this, but I for the life of me, cannot understand those of our countrymen saying this. I do not understand how they fail to understand that this crisis which has come in the Socialist countries and particularly Soviet Union is to our great disadvantage also. It is not something which is going to help us. It is going to weaken us also. So, what is

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

there to gloat about? What is there to be so happy about? I really do not understand it. However, because of that, partly because of that partly because of our own economic crisis, I should say that we must be more vigilant. I say economic crisis because that is what the Government has been saying for the last three or four months. The Government says that we are standing on the brink of a precipice, our coffers are empty and if we do not go to the IMF and ask them for loans, if we do not fulfil whatever conditions they want and if we do not get the money, we will not be able to meet our obligations and we will become international defaulters, etc. Therefore, the rupee has been devalued, and our gold has been transferred out of the country! All these things happened. Well, these are not directly Shri Faleiro's doings. I do not ask him to react to these. But facts are facts.

Therefore Sir, though I agree with Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav and Shri Vajpayee that when we won our Independence, we were not economically a very big and strong power at all, nevertheless by the force of our convictions, by the force of our principles and values which we stood for, we were able to project an international image of India of which we are proud. But today, I also think that your economic basis has something to do with your foreign policy. You cannot always say that it does not matter even if your economy is weak, your foreign policy can be as strong as it always was.

16.28 hrs

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

The trouble now is this. What I am apprehensive about is that - we are going to adopt a policy - an economic policy or financial policy - which may make us, unless we are very vigilant, increasingly dependent on aid from abroad. We always took aid from abroad. It is nothing new. But if it makes us *increasingly dependent on aid from abroad*, - and not from socialist countries, mind you - if we are increasingly dependent on aid from the other group, I am not so sure that it will not have some reaction, some effects on our foreign policy. That I want the Government to be very careful about.

The main criticism that I wish to make today is that there seems to be a lack of initiative. I admit that the time that has passed since all these events have taken place, is very short and one should not jump to conclusions just now. I do not wish to jump to conclusions. But I am noticing a little thread which seems to me to suggest that there is some lack of initiative developing. It is not enough to say as the hon. Minister in his opening remarks has said that these are the various countries and this is how very very correct and formal relations are being maintained with them and that everything is fine. Well, I have got a word of praise for the Ministry for the work it had done last year in evacuating our countrymen from the Gulf area. A very excellent job was done for which they deserve the highest praise. I have no doubt about it. But India is something more. I think the Third World Countries used to look up to India for support, for help and for solidarity and that is our biggest capital. That should not be allowed to be diluted in anyway; may be consciously or unconsciously, willy-nilly or under pressure of certain economic compulsion. That should be avoided by us. We must go out to take the initiative as we used to take earlier. But that I am afraid is not happening now. I would like to give just two or three examples.

Take the case of Kampuchia. Something is happening there. We are all looking forward eagerly to some sort of settlement between the varied factions in Kampuchia which will permit elections to be held there. I hope that is not a very remote future. And, then some kind of democratically elected Government will emerge which will at least bring some peace and order to that long suffering country.

In this Report of the Ministry of External

Affairs there is also a reference to the fact that relations with Kampuchia continues to be close and friendly. Then it refers to the visit of the Prime Minister, Hun Sien from 7th to 11 October, 1990, etc. Prime Minister Hun Sien stresses the importance of India; continuing to play a role in the Cambodian settlement and participating in the United Nations transitional authority in Cambodia. This is mentioned here and I am glad that it has been mentioned here that the Prime Minister of Cambodia was expecting something from us.

I know that India has in the past played positive role as far as settlement of Cambodia is concerned. We were able to participate in the Paris Conference also which had taken place earlier. But, now at the closing stage of this Cambodian crisis when settlement is in sight and, I think we should ask ourselves what India is doing now; can we not take some initiative to help its settlement to come about. They are our friends. Prime Minister Hun Sien is our close friend. He came here to seek our help and cooperation. I am told that there is a proposal afoot in the United Nations that if elections come about in Cambodia perhaps a United Nations Peace Keeping Force will be sent there to look after things while elections are held. But I am also informed that among the countries which are provisionally being settled or named by the United Nations to participate or to send their contingents in the Peace Keeping Force, India is not there. I am very surprised.

Another tradition of India is that wherever peace keeping forces go whether it is Cyprus, Namibia, Vietnam or Korea, India has never been left out. India is a symbol of peace. It has always contributed a contingent to these peace keeping forces. Our name was always suggested by other countries. But why is it this India is being omitted from Peace Keeping Force which is proposed for Kampuchia? I think all these things need to be looked into. We should not relegate ourselves to some kind of second rank as we are the one who have done so much in the past for all these people. We have played a big role. We should see to it that our initiative is not truncated.

We are a Member of the Security Council. We are proud of the fact that we have again returned to the Security Council. Membership of the Security Council imposes certain obligations on us no doubt but it also gives us some leverage or some status. And, here I would like to say something. I do not approve fully of the role that we are playing as Security Council Member in the affairs of Iraq. Iraq committed a big wrong doing. A big international crime was committed by Saddam Hussain in carrying out aggression against Kuwait. But subsequently, what is happening? As Members of the Security Council, we have said here that "India fully subscribe to and faithfully abided by all the Resolutions of the U.N. Security Council in this regard despite the cost to her economy resulting from the compliance with the Security Council Resolution 661 imposing economic sanctions against Iraq."

Iraq has been defeated in the War. Defeated means that their military power has been completely smashed, pulverised. We recall those days when pursuant to the Security Council's Resolution, the United States carried out almost unprecedented bombing attacks on Iraqi cities, including the civilian population, not only of military targets and all that. That was perhaps the price you can say that Iraq had to pay for the blunder that it had committed. One of the aims of the United States which is still declared by President Bush that we will not rest until this man Saddam Hussein is removed from power. That aim has not been achieved yet. I hope, it is not one of our aims also. At any cost, this man Saddam Hussein must go then only we can deal with Iraq, in a different way. That is what President Bush's stand is. But they have not been able to remove Saddam Hussein. He may be a good man. He may be a bad man. He may be an evil man or any damn thing. But the point that I am making is that we have information about the effect of the so called economic sanctions that are having on the civilian population in Iraq, on the women and on the chil-

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

dren. We have been informed here that more than five thousand children have died and about fifteen thousand are on the door step of death because of hunger, starvation and mal nutrition. They are not able to get essential food stuffs, medicines, nothing because of this sanction. The Sanctions Committee of the United Nations includes all the Members of the Security Council. What are we doing there? Why should we not raise our voice, at least that sanctions ae not meant to punish the civilian population in Iraq? You can destroy the Iraqi Army, if you like. Now three or four days ago, it was being revealed how the tanks of the United States buried thousands of Iraqi soldiers alive in the sand by using some new techniques and all that. It is a horrible thing. But anyway that is a military operation. But I am talking about the suffering of the civilians. I do not think that India should keep quiet on this issue. It is not in our tradition at all. If you would permit me, I have some document here which I want to quote. It is a Report of Mr. Marty Intisary, the United Nations Secretary General' personal representative. The Date of the Report is 30th March, 1991.

"In pursuance of his Report, a Harvard University Medical team recently visited Iraq and found that hundreds of thousands of children face death over the coming months as a result of the combined effects of bombing against Iraq and the continued imposition of sanctions. Dr. Rob Noodle - they are all Americans - has reported, on behalf of the Harvard team that, as a result of the team's survey, based on field work visits to eleven major cities in Iraq. " we have conservatively estimated that the mortality rate for children under five will produce 170,000 additional deaths in this age group". Dr. Noodle described the situatidn in Iraq as a "Pubiic health catastrophe".

Because of the bombing during the hostilities, sewage treatment, drinking water supply, refrigeration of medicine and the operation of hospitals have become extremely difficult or nearly impossible to manage. Cholera and typhoid are reaching epidemic proportions." The Harvard team's forecast was corroborated by Dr. Ezin Murzil of the UNICEF who said that "80 per cent of children under one year of age are already facing severe malnutrition." I can go on like this because there are so many more facts and figures. I am saying that there is a limit to all this.

It is one thing to join with the other powers in condemning the aggression of Iraq on Kuwait, and if you like, supporting even the American military adventures there. But it is quite another thing, long after the war is over, to go on supporting this type of barbarous sanctions which are preventing the common people and even children there from getting the necessities of life.

And therefore, if he likes, if he has not seen this report, I can hand it over. Have you got it? I hope that he has seen it. Because, there are many facts in this which you may study. You can verify them also.

But my point is, that consistent with India's past all record and tradition of caring for humanity and humane causes, something should be done. I am told that in the Security Council on this question of sanctions the Iraqi Government had only asked for permission that the sanctions be relaxed to the extent of allowing them to purchase some food and medicines from abroad by a limited sale of their oil. If they could sell a certain quantity of oil and get the money with which they could find the foodstuffs, medicine, milk and all that then these populations would be able to survive. But that request was turned down and what was India doing? I would like to know. I am told that only Yemen and Cuba, only those two countries, voted in favour of that Iraqi proposal. Nobody else. That is why I am worried. I am worried, because where are we going? I do not like to say it but we should not allow economic compulsions to dilute or water down our record and our principles in this matter, for one thing.

Then another matter I wish to refer to, it is mentioned also briefly in the report, is Myanmar, that is, Burma, one of our neighbouring countries. At least, I am glad that this report has pointed out that a popularly elected government, of popular forces, democratic forces, which won a big electoral victory, a resounding victory in the elections there, is not allowed to assume power. The military junta there in Burma has prevented them physically from taking power. In fact, some of their leaders have been arrested and thrown into prison and that military junta is running the show. And the democratically elected representatives of the people are not permitted to exercise their rights. So, it has been noted here. But this is another question on which I would like to ask he Government, if we are not in a position to take any initiative. This is an issue which we should raise in different international fora. It is a question of human rights also. Why is the voice of India not being heard? Perhaps they may not listen to us, they may not heed us, but the point is that India's voice should be heard. I am worried about our own reputation, about our own credibility. I do not care what those other countries do. But it hurts us that earlier India played certain role, and was well-known for some values and norms, and we should not keep mum about it now. Why should we keep mum?

I am very glad that the hon. Prime Minister visited Germany and has got a warm reception there. He is also very satisfied with the response he found there among different circles regarding their attitude towards India and all that. That is fine. But I should like the voice of India to be heard more stridently on some of these questions.

The way you are looking at me, Sir, I feel that you are about to ring the bell. So, I am only mentioning some points and I will finish.

Then about this proposed West Asian Conference on the Palestine question. It is a good thing. We have welcomed it also. But is it or is it not a fact that the main obstruction to such a conference is being created by Israel, and even the United States has become annoyed with them and is saying that they should not adopt this kind of obstructionist role when the possibilities of a West Asian peace Conference for the first time have materialised. We should say something also. Who is obstructing? Who is obstructing? You can open a Consulate General of Israel in Delhi as Shri Vajpayee has suggested. I do not mind. But this is the key question, West Asia, as far as Israel is concerned. Because all over these years, Israel has been acting as a surrogate of the U.S.A. in the Middle East and now if they are forced to come to the Peace Conference Table, that is proposed, it will be a good thing and naturally I am not surprised if they try to obstruct it. But India's voice should be heard on those issues. We should not be afraid of calling a spade a spade. Then, on the question of Afghan settlement, good bright prospects are opening now since both the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. have declared publicly that they are going to stop sending any more aims to either side, and let the Afghan settle the issue themselves without any external weapon supply or arms race from outside. It is a good thing. And I hope that something will materialise out of it. The President, Mr. Najib, has been a good friends of India. We have had close relations with him always. He had visited this country as our honoured guest in the past. And I do think that the Government of India, not in a very obtrusive way as though they want to spoke their nose into everything, but they should maintain the closest contacts with President Najib and see if there is any way by which India in a discreet way, in a diplomatic way, can help in speeding up the prospect of a settlement.

I agree fully with what has been restated here. In our own interest, we want an Afghan, which is peaceful and non-aligned. That is in our own interest. I am also conscious of the fact that something is happening in the Muslim Republics of the Soviet Union bordering on Afghanistan. We do not know what the future holds. I cannot say; you cannot say. There are fundamentalist forces, which have been working for a long time in Uzbekistan, in Tadzhikstan, in Azerbaijan, in Kazakhistan and other places. You see, they were not able to play a very predominent role

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

in their respectiva areas so long as they were within the Soviet family. Once thay try to break out, there are many forces which will try to raise thair heads and we do not want soma kind of negative influences to grow thara which may affect periphery of our country, which has a vital security perception for us. So, we should devalop closest friendly relations with Afghanistan, with Najib and try our best to see that a proper settlement is brought about.

About Pakistan, I agree with what other fiends have said here. I think, the Government of India is doing what it can to see that the Pakistan's game is foiled. They seem to be more adept than us, more expert than us, in projecting their own image abroad in different fora of the world. I do not know why it happens. Why should there be many people in other countries supporting them against us on the question of Kashmir? Something is wrong in our projecting this issue properly. That should be looked into.

Then, Sir, I would say that there is the question of developing cooperation, as the Minister has emphasised, with our neighbouring countries, friendly relations. That is a priority job no doubt - whether it is Nepal or Sri Lanka or other countries. With Nepal, there is a plenty of scope as has been pointed out here for all types of cooperation, economic and other cooperation; the joint ventures in tha field of projects which will benefit both Nepal and India; and I am sura that the Government will do its best to explore all these possibilities and give our unstinted cooperation and support in this matter.

Finally, I too feel a little bit of remorse or regret that one of the countries - We cannot do anything about it - which was along with us, one of the pioneers of this non-alignment, Yugoslavia, Tito's Yugoslavia - at one time in the name of Nehru, Nasar and Tito, these were the big three of the Non-Aligned Movement, who galvanised the whole world with their concept of non-alignment and moved together and mobilised many countries on this common platform - is now facing a tremendous internal crisis and is breaking up. It is a very regretful fact that a kind of civil war is raising there. Croatia and Serbia ara trying to break way. And everyday, our Doordarshan, which does not show many things which should be shown, never fails every single day in showing at least eight to ten minutes of fighting going on in Yugoslavia. I do not know what is the point. How does it help us? Somebody was saying the this may give ideas to secessionists in our country and all that. I do not know. I do not know what is the policy of our Doordarshan. Why they are so much adamant of showing the Indian people everyday how Yugoslavia is breaking-up due to armed struggle between different groups there? I think, the Prime Minister may kindly look into this. It should have a little restraint. Occasionally, they may give us a little news of Yugoslavia. But, this should not become a major item in everyday's news telecast. What is the idea? We cannot do anything. But a little nostalgic sorrow and unhappines should be there. We wish Yugoslavia as a country would be able to restore its normal conditions. I know, they are made up of different ethnic constituents. But, after all, we can be sympathetic about them because we are facing all typs of problems in our country. We know that these are difficult problems to solve and we would certainly like Yugoslavia to find a way by which they will be able to stop this fighting and restore peace and normalcy and the country may be able to prosper and progress.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASHIMHA RAO): I am grateful to the hon. Members who have made such a meaningful contribution to the Debate. I also feel a little disappointed that this year the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs could not come before the House as they have always been coming year after year and I think this should be the last year in which such a thing has happened. From next year, we should see to it that the Ministry of External Affairs, India's Foreign Policy, is brought into focus as it has always been brought. Of course, it is nobody's fault. We are not on the point of fault-finding at the moment. But, I agree that we should restore it back to the position of importance it always had.

We are really discussing something which has baffled the whole world. The changes in the world during the last few years and probably during the last few months, have been so quick, so difficult to explain in terms of time, in terms of motivation, in terms of immediate or remote cause. So, there is an element of bafflement, an element of the unknown, unforseen, unanticipated in all these events. And therefore, when you are in the midst of such quick baffling changes, what you see in front of you is a new set of uncertainties. We do not know how this has happened and we do not know equally what is going to happen next. At best we can only make an assessment of the situation and on the basis of that assessment, we could perhaps in a vague manner, in a general way, determine the policy of our Government or determine about the policies of other Governments, other powers in the world. So, the inter-action also becomes full of uncertainties and, therefore, today when we talk of foreign policy, when we talk of the international situation, no one can say for sure that what he is saying is bound to happen and what someone else is saying will never happen. So, this is the kind of new uncertainty in which we find ourselves today. There is nothing wrong in owning this, in admitting this. And this uncertainty is common to all parties. Since we have had a consensus on foreign policy right from the beginning, it is good that all the speeches which I have had the occasion to listen to are having the same import and same purport in their main essentials. So, I would say that here we are in the quest for a new policy framework for the country, both inside the movement of Non-Alignment as an important country, as the Founder Member of the Movement of Non-Alignment, and also as India *per se*. This uncertainty and this quest will have to continue in a united manner and we will have to find a consensus on the new role of India in the future.

The Congress manifesto has, to some extent, anticipated the important aspects of the international situation. It has said, and I quote:

> "We have succeeded in persuading the whole world to fulfil Jawaharlal Nehru's vision of a world without competing blocs, a world of *detente*, a world moving towards disarmament."

Now, we can legitimately claim some credit for having done this, having been important partners in this Movement towards Non-Alignment, towards disarmament and towards *detente*. The House will recall that under Panditji, under Indiraji, under Rajivji, and under Lal Bahadur Shastriji, we have continued the relentless quest for *detente*, we have always spoken up for *detente*, we have always spoken up for disarmament and, in fact, we have given our own interpretation of disarmament, our own picture of what we consider disarmament, complete and total disarmament is our vision, and we have contributed to this. Therefore, this quest, this role of India would have to continue and I would like to say that it will continue.

We have also said it is for us to ensure that the ending of the cold war does not mean domination of any one power centre. Precisely on this point, we have had several speeches now. It will be India's endeavour to see that the end of the cold war or the emergence of only one power bloc or superpower, does not mean the subjugation "of all other countries who, on some issue or the other, do not see eye to eye with that superpower". I have no doubt in my mind that India will have to play that role. It need not be confrontation. There is no need for confrontation. Even in a democratised United Nations, for instance, for which we are making all efforts, there is possibility, there is likelihood of a difference of opinion, and if that democratisation continues on the right lines, India will have a role to play. There is no question of the role of India and similar countries coming to an end. Therefore, what we are looking for is a democratised func-

[Sh. P. V. Narashimha Rao]

tioning of the word community wherein the decision is not on the basis of armaments, on the basis of money power, on the basis of other considerations, but on the basis of justice and fairplay, and that should be our endeavour. So, it is the same struggle in a different context, with different tools perhaps, in different fora. Therefore, i do not think that the role of India which we have cherished so far will ever end and I am absolutely certain that we will continue this.

17.00 hrs

If we have not been active for the last one or two years, let us leave that past behind and look ahead. Nothing has really been lost. Maybe a little visibility of India has been lost. But we can always restore it and I am sure about it.

We have also said it is for us to ensure that the emergence of new economic powers such as Germany and Japan works for the betterment of the poor and not only for the enrichment of the rich. This is what my visit to Germany is all about. We have found that it is not a uni-polar world in all respects. Yes, in the military sense it is uni-polar; but in the economic sense it is multi-polar, it is multi-centric. Therefore, there is really no point in only emphasizing the uni-polar nature of the world. There are so many economic power centres in the world. And India is not an economic power centre as such but India has an importance which cannot be ignored by any economic power centre, and that came out loud and clear in my visit to Germany. I am happy about it because it is not simply what we are going to get from Germany tomorrow that we discussed about. It is something much more, it is something much further, where does India stand in tomorrow's set up, the new set up, the new set up of Europe, for instance. Now, I am convinced, I have been assured that India will not be outside that imaginery fortress that will be built in Europe in 1992. I have been assured that India will have an entry into that fortress. I do not even call it a fortress because that was said by those who were the detractors of the European market, the single economy that is going to come. But, when we are told that we have friends within Europe, who will not let India to be left out - not because it is only India that is asking for it, but because India is an important country which nobody can ignore and, therefore, we are assured of India's place, India's entry. Of course, everything will depend on our own performance. It is not as if someone is going to give us everything and we need not do anything on our part. That is where out timely policy changes, our re-orientation of our economic policies, come into the picture. And in the light of all these changes, we find that India is now assured of a place of importance as she always had.

So, it is for us to see that this works for the betterment of the poor and not only for the enrichment of the rich. We have started the concept of G-15 in the Non-aligned Movement. This is what India has done, almost single-handed, at the Belgrade Summit, where these G-15 countries, that is countries of the Third world, developing countries, can take some lead in all the problems of the developing world, and they could also stand up so that they become an important factor in the economic scenario of the world tomorrow. This was the idea. And the idea was accepted by the Non-aligned Movement. Yes, what has happened in Yugoslavia, what is happening in Yugoslavia now, leaves the Movement a little defunct, in the sense that it is not functioning. But at the same time Yugoslavia's importance has not been lost. We have nothing but friendship with Yugoslavia. And I do not know what the Doordarshan is showing. I have no idea, how many minutes it is showing about the happenings of Yugoslavia. But I would certainly like to say that Yugoslavia is one of our friendliest countries. We will certainly see to it that what was started in Yugoslavia in 1989 will continue and we will work on it. We have the commitment to work on it and that is why the meeting of the G-15 is going to be held in Venezuela. And it is going to be an important Meeting. Never mind what happens, but it is present for the time being in a particular country. But what sprouted in Yugoslavia, what sprouted in 1989 in Belgrade is not going to go waste, it is going to be acted upon, and I am sure India will certainly play her role in that event also.

Sir, the new world order based on the philosophy of non-violence initiated by Gandhiji and incorporated in the 1986 Delhi Declaration—what happens to that commitment? We stand committed to that. It is true that we are having disarmament. Much has happened, much more needs to happen in the field of disarmament. The intermediate missiles more or less have been wiped out, and then there is a sizeable reduction in the other missiles and so on. But there is nothing like total and complete disarmament yet in sight. Even today the armaments that they have are enough to destroy the world many many times over. So, what are we really talking about? We are talking about a very slow and very limited amount of disarmament that has been brought about. But what India stands for is total, complete disarmament and not only disarmament in the sense of not having nuclear arms, but a world which is free from nuclear weapons and also it is non-violence. If you completely destroy nuclear weapons today but after 10 years if another kind of weapon which may not be called 'nuclear' but which may be something much more destructive than a nuclear weapon suddenly emerges from somewhere, from some power, then you have not really contributed to that world of non-violence which you talked about in 1986. Therefore, it is not merely the negative aspect of doing away with nuclear weapons, but positively creating a non-violent world to which President Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi committed their countries to in 1986. That commitment, Mr. Speaker, Sir, remains, and that commitment India will complete. So, it is not as if India is left without a role.

Now, we have been again baffled by what happened in the Soviet Union. I have just spoken about Yugoslavia. The Soviet Union is a much larger country, much more powerful and very important country in world affairs, to which we have always been looking for friendship and support, and we continue to have the same friendly relations and close relations with the Soviet Union.

Apart from what happens to the future of the Soviet Union about which I am not as pessimistic as some people are, I would like to say that in respect of our relations with the Soviet Union, about which some people might think that these relations may get shattered, our treaties for instance, our agreements for instance, economic cooperation for instance, might be in doldrums, I believe this is only a passing phase, I believe this is only a temporary phase. The relations between our two countries are not merely based on a treaty or on certain agreements, but we have subscribed to certain principles, and I am quite sure that a large country like the Soviet Union just cannot go to pieces and just disappear, it is not possible. They will certainly find a way of again consolidating the country, may be on different lines, maybe in a different context, but I do not see anything beyond that happening, which would completely disrupt our relations either in the economic field or in the political field. I do not expect that. I cannot spell out anything more, nor can any Members spell out anything more than this at the moment, not even the friends abroad with whom I have had occasion to speak. Everyone seems to be equally uncertain; everyone seems to be hopeful this minute, not so hopeful the next minute. But, we would say, as friends of the Soviet Union, that the relations between the two countries are not going to be disrupted. We will certainly continue the relationship. There may be certain lacunae, for instance in the supplies, in exports and in the nitty-gritty of our relations. These are important; we cannot minimise the importance of these things. But I understand that whenever we have taken up any of these matters with the Soviet authorities, they have responded with whatever expedition that they could manage at the moment; may be after two months, three months or four months they would respond more expeditiously. There had never been a cold shouldering on whatever we have taken to them. There had never been a negative response from them and therefore, we have

[Sh. P. V. Narashimha Rao]

nothing to worry about it except that we will have to wait for the time, when on the other side our friends are able to respond properly. That is all that I have to say about Indo-Soviet relationship.

Then, there was some mention of Burma. The House may recall that we did do our bit in the situation which developed in Burma two years ago. We were, to some extent, helpful. The military Government of Burma was very bitter about India on whatever we did and I do not see any reason why we should not play a constructive and helpful role in the situation. I would not like to say anything more, because I am not fully conversant with whatever had been done during the last three years, or not done. But, I am sure that the role which we played earlier when there was a big change in Burma, that role naturally will not be discontinued; in whatever manner it is possible, we will certainly do our duty.

Sir, the UN role also has come up for some comments in the debate. I am sure that the UN has come into its own after all these changes. We have had a much more important role assigned to UN in the last two or three years and in this role, in the assigning of this role, in the expansion of the UN role, we also have contributed our bit. There is hardly any speech of the External Affairs Minister of India or the Prime Minister of India which did not emphasise a much more decisive and important role for the UN. We have said even in the case of disarmament, in the case of the verification regimes under the disarmament dispensation, the UN must have a much bigger role. I think, that is saying quite a bit, but we have advocated that role for the UN. We will continue to advocate that. We are a member of the Security Council right now, but that is something which comes and goes. We have suggested the expansion of the Security Council. This may not materialise this year or next year, but this is something which is in conformity with the general wise of several countries in the world. The situation in which the original Security Council was formed, that situation has changed beyond recognition. So many countries have become free; so many countries are playing such important roles in world affairs today that the Security Council as it was conceived of 45 years ago, needs to change and needs to be expanded and India is taking a lead in this important role in bringing about or trying to bring about this change.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Have you suggested anything with regard to the veto power of the permanent members?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: We are concentrating on expansion. I think, we do the easier things first. I am not even saying that it is going to be easy, but we have friends in this. We have supporters in this and this would be the better strategy to go about it. This role will continue and I am sure that what we have promised to the people of India, what we have committed to do, we will stand by that commitment.

Shri Indrajit Gupta has said something about the West Asia question. Our commitment to the West Asia question is quite clear. It has been there for years and if there is a conference, we would certainly welcome the conference. We are for the conference and we have said so in the manifesto. We have taken that commitment to the people and we will stand by that.

About neighbours, I am sure, the details will be given by my colleague, Shri Eduardo Faleiro. But what I would like to say is that we have not been quite successful in persuading Pakistan to improve relations with India. Every time there is a change either in Pakistan or in India, there is a sense of euphoria created, some new hopes are aroused. But subsequently these hopes are dashed to the ground. My own experience during the last three months has been more or less the same. I was told by the Prime Minister of Pakistan that he would like to send a special envoy here. In fact, he was so insistent that I thought that something new was going to happen, something very hopeful was going to emerge. I agreed. The special envoy came. After talking to him, again he tried to create an impression that this is a new situation and a new leaf is being turned between the two countries. Since I was only at the listening end, I was not in a position to respond one way or the other. He told me in so many words, when I raised the question of their helping, training and assisting the terrorists. He told me in so many words that "You will see a definite improvement on the ground." These were his words. So, I told him, " I will wait for the improvement". We have been waiting. I am told that 'improvement' has been on the reverse. So, where do we stand? What do we do? We stand exactly where we stood always. We have to be ready for any eventuality but at the same time, we have to persist in our efforts to improve relations to the extent we can. They are raising Kashmir in more forums today than they ever did before. That seems to be the 'improvement'. So what do we do? I really do not understand, except to come to the conclusion that we have to live with this. I do not have any other conclusion to arrive at. Still let us hope that in the big changes that are coming all over the world where the volition of one country or the motivation of one country does not really mean anything, where all countries are being forced into certain position by circumstances, if this would bring Pakistan to a position more friendly to India, more neighbourly relations, desiring better neighbourly relations with India, then we would be happy. So far as we are concerned, we are very clear in our mind. Our intention is to have the best of relations with Pakistan and this intention will continue and we will have to live with whatever uncertainties we have with Pakistan, still hoping that at some point of time, relations will really improve.

With Bangladesh, the Bangladesh Foreign Minister came here recently. He called on me and I had a long talk with him. I find that there is some promise of further improvement in the relations. We are expecting the Prime Minister of Bangladesh sometime later and we would like to hope that relations will really improve. We have some problems, some intractable problems with Bangladesh like the Chakma question and the latest is that some fuelling of terrorism across the border in the North-East area also is taking place from Bangladesh. Of course, as always, it has been denied. But we are fairly clear that this is happening. We will have to take up with Bangladesh this question also. I do hope that overall, there will be improvement.

There are again some compulsions where the economic situation in both the countries, the economic cooperation between India and Bangladesh is too good an aspect to be ignored. We have been talking with them on so many projects. For the last 10-11 years at least I know that we have been continuing this dialogue. But, on the other side, there has not been much movement, much forward movement. But now with a democratic Government on the other side, we hope that there will be some forward movement hereafter and we are waiting for further efforts on both sides and responses from both sides, responses of the right type.

About Nepal, I am told that, again, the emergence of a democratic Government on the other side in Nepal has had some effect, some positive effect. We expect that the arrangements in regard to some of the rivers originating from Nepal, about which negotiations have been bogged down for quite some time, are showing some signs of forward movement. I cannot give more details than this. But I understand generally that there has been some forward movement. Let us hope this movement will continue.

Sri Lanka is going to hold the next SAARC summit and we hope to improve relations with Sri Lanka except that we have the LTTE problem, the problem which has been very much there in India, which has spilled over to India. Then, we have the allied problem of refugees from Sri Lanka whose burden is becoming more and more difficult to bear off our side. These questions need to be sorted out.

So far as other relations are concerned,

[Sh. P. V. Narashimha Rao]

I do not think there is anything to complain. Specially, the areas of difference, areas of different perception, maybe, will have to be sorted out. These are some of the points I wanted to mention in this short intervention. What I would like to say, in general, is that India's role in the Non-Aligned Movement not only in redefining the contours of the Movement in the new context but also taking a role, an important lead in getting those contours properly Implemented, in both these respects, India's hold will continue and this Government wants to continue the hold as vigorously as we did it before. Within the South Asian framework, the SAARC network, SAARC programme we would like to intensify the programme. I understand that there has been a little forward movement, of late, on the economic side also. As the House is aware whenever we brought up economic cooperation, cooperation in the field of trade, commerce etc. In the SAARC, there has been a persistent resistance particularly from Pakistan. Since the groundrule says that unless all the seven countries agree nothing will go through, the economic aspect of the SAARC cooperation has remained, more or less in coldstorage. Now I understand there are some negotiations going on - with what result, we cannot predict. But at least there has been a consent for carrying on negotiations. So, those negotiations on the basis of which some kind of economic cooperation among SAARC countries could be forged, those negotiations are going on. And if they result in something positive, then, I think, the ice will be broken on a very important aspect of SAARC. People have been saying, experts have been saying: Why not have a common market for all the SAARC countries. All these can materialise in course of time only if the initial ice is broken for which I find that there has been favourable atmosphere of late. It may be long haul, I do not know. But if this does materialise, then, I think, the future of SAARC is assured in the sense that not only in other matters like meteorology and other things but on important matters of economic cooperation, there will be real progress.

This is all I wanted to say. We want a little time. This Government has taken over just about three months back. The moment we took over, we came to Parliament. The directions have been given, the commitment has been reiterated in the Congress Manifesto. The commitment is nothing very different from what the other parties also have committed themselves to do. So, there is an inbuilt consensus. What remains to be done is to take concrete initiatives in each of these areas. We are on the point of taking further initiatives. We would certainly like some more time to be given to this Government in order to show results in taking those initiatives. I hope, that the House will bear with this Government on these matters. Maybe in the next session or may be in the next Budget, by the time we come back for the next year's Budget, we will be able to show some more initiatives actually taken, positively taken in many of these matters in which we have a clear commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: I have a long list of Members. I would like to know for how much time the House is prepared to sit. Depending on that decision, we can give the time to the Members to speak.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: How many names are there?

MR. SPEAKER: It is a long list.

(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GULAM NABI AZAD): We require minimum one hour.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I think, let us continue to sit for one more hour. And the other Members will please bear in mind that the time is limited and they will complete their speeches in a short time without repeating the points which are already made.

Now I call Shri Shahabuddin to speak.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dum Dum): You have not called any name from the CPI (M) side.

MR. SPEAKER: After this.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is rather difficult to speak on the emerging situation after the intervention by the Prime Minister and also after a brilliant scintillating speech by a former Foreign Minister under whom I had the good fortune to serve, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee.

We all speak of momentus changes that are rapidly changing the contours of the world. The Prime Minister finds it, for some time, baffling. But, Sir, let us look a little below the surface. We are indeed at the threshold of a new era. And we do not know what is going to happen, what is going to come. I have a feeling that today we are entering the era of ethnicities. Submerged identities of people are surfacing and asserting their rights to be recognised and to be treated with dignity. They are breaking through existing world of international relations and the existing pattern of nation-states through a simultaneous process of fission and fusion. Divided ethnicities are fusing across borders and multi-ethnic formations are subjected to fission. A new balance of power is going to come into existence and new alignments will take place both on a global and on a regional basis, A new world order is indeed emerging. We find the contours heavy at the moment. The international situation is in a flux. But, we have this question before us. Is it going to lead to PAX AMERICANA or is it going to PAX HUMANA? Is this new alignment to give rise to new conventions and new covenants, new chapters and new declarations, which would lead us to a disarmed world, to a denuclearised world and not to a disenfranchised world? Are we moving towards a life in which the differences - the economic differences and disparities between peoples and regions shall be wider than they are today? Shall we assert the sovereignty and equality of man or shall we give rise to a new imperialism and new colonialism; a turn of the history; pattern of dominance being the state of art? Shall we get the old wine in a new bottle or shall we get a old bottle with a new label?

We, as a nation, must reject the concept of unipolar world or a world which is reduced growingly to a monolithic centre of power, to a centralised global decision making and to a world where control, administration and management is located in a White House or in a Kremlin. This apprehension is not illusory; this apprehension is very real. Even some wise men in the West are conscious of this phase. I have a quotation here from Professor Noam Chomsky of the MIT, who, in an article, called "The weak shall inherit nothing" says that looking towards the millennium, stands out the central message from the White House: "We are masters and you shine our shoes". This is what an American Scholar has to say about the new world order of Mr. George Bush. And we have also a great British writer, Mr. Harold Pinter, a dramatist. He had a new ten minute play on the Broadway, called the New World Order which revolves around three persons - one a ragged, gogged and blindfolded and tied to a Chair and the other two in shirt and tie looming over him and casually deciding his fate. This was perhaps, the dramatist's picture of the new world order. We have got to strive as a nation and as a people to stop it.

We are all conscious of the great changes that have taken place in the Soviet Union. I for one, hail the surge of democracy and freedom. I consider it a momentous event in the world's history; and that a revolution has taken place without violence; that change has taken place without bloodshed and that transformation has taken place without coercion. I do not look upon it as the end of socialist ideology. I look upon it as the fulfillment of the original promise of the 1917 revolution, when Mr. Lenin promised freedom to the people of the East. I do not look upon it as a fragmentation of the Soviet Union, but the transformation of the union into a union of ethnicities for cooperation on

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

terms of equality and inter-dependence without any element of exploitation, or coercien. Just like the Soviet Union, multi-ethnic States are breaking down everywhere. Science and technology know no frontiers, either ideological, political or geographical. The global information systems are reaching out into an era where the entire concept of secrecy or censor by Governments has lost its meaning. Global events now penetrate our homes all over the world. Therefore, a revolutionary concept is now coming in the plea of domestic jurisdiction and is increasingly losing its meaning.

There has to be a democratic control over the Government operations everywhere. All peoples are asking for good governance. There is of course the question of control over natural resources. I regard all natural resources of the world as the common heritage of mankind. We have already accepted this concept with regard to the sea and the sea-bed and the space. I think a time is coming when the entire earth which is the habitat of the species called man, with all its renewable and non-renewable resources shall be equitably available to all the members of this species, wherever dispersed over land or sea or space. Thus shall man become centre to the global concern, central to the global scheme of things and that is why we have to respond to this new urge for human rights, for group rights and if I borrow a phrase from the West, for good governance.

There are certain in-built constraints on the emergence of the unipolar world. But we have to work and endeavour in the direction with determination and clarity. There is of course the mathematical problem or the geographical problem of an effective radius. I think no power can direct all the affairs of the world from one single centre. There is the question of ethnic affinities which shall determine the intensity of intercourse among the neighbouring regions. There is the concept of three tier world. You have an ethnic State and you have a regional system of security and cooperation and of course a world order.

These changes are taking place slowly before our very eyes. Maybe, we are not very conscious of them. But this will also call for a certain change in diplomacy. The inter-State system is today giving place to a real international system. We have been speaking of the word 'international' for a long time. But I make a distinction. So far we had an Inter-State system; tomorrow we shall have a real international system. There, nations which are newly emerging shall discard the conventional forms of cooperation or relationship and our old patterns of diplomacy will no longer be adequate.

The existing structures, if they are not responsive or paid attention to, will only result in dinosaurs, which became extinct in the process of evolution. I would, however, like to make one more point here. The basic concept to a unipolar world is this. The Marxian concept of class has not been able to define and determine human behaviour in its totality. The Freudian concept of sex has not succeeded either. The Jungian concept of power also did not succeed and I am afraid, the American concept of market by placing a false God in a new pantheon will also not able to determine the entire development of human interaction.

There has to be a quest for human expression. The desire for power, for group identity , for what we call national rights, has to be tampered by a new humanism, by a quest for justice. Therefore, I come to my basic point that we are not against a new world order; but we are for a just world order.

The world that I envisage for tomorrow is going to be a three dimensional world, is going to be multipolar world, is going to be a multilateral world and a multi-tier world structure. They concede the beginning of a multipolarity, whether Americans like it or not. There are the economic groupings and regional groupings. I am sure in the long run, Europe and Latin America will not stay together; they shall form different polarity. There is China and Japan; there is South-East Asia emerging into its own life; there is South Asia making a new beginning. There is the Arab world; there is Black Africa and Latin America and each one of them has got a certain ethnic homogeneity. These are going to be the bricks for the future structure of the world. What we have to look for is this. We find a new equilibrium and a new balance between national formation and the regional formation. There should be a built-in linkage between these national and regional formations into global formations so that we can manage the affairs of mankind with a little more wisdom and a little more peace.

The UN has to be democratised. But we have to keep in view that the distortion has been caused not only by the Veto granted to five powers only, but also by the theoretical and illusory concept of sovereign equality of States. There has to be some equilibrium; some relationship between the power equations outside the UN forum and the power equations inside. Otherwise, if I may tell Mr. Vajpayee, even if the General Assembly is brought into the picture, it will not be difficult for some big powers to buy the support, to purchase the support of the mini and micro States.

Therefore, we have to address ourselves to the democratisation in a manner that the UN does become a real instrument for managing the affairs of mankind on the basis of equality and on the basis of justice. There, we come to the North-South dialogue. Mr. Speaker, Sir, my point is that our diplomacy has been taking part in the North-South dialogue. But the North-South dialogue has to be intensified. It is related to the terms of international trade of raw materials and manufactures. It must be related to the terms of transfer of technology and to the terms of flow of capital. All these must come in and these should become a matter of global concern, just as environment or space or the resources of space and the sea. For this what is the policy that we have to adopt? What is the tool that we have to adopt? I think the long-tested tool non-alignment can still serve us. Non-alignment has been wrongly described as a policy. Non-alignment, to my mind, is an instrument of peace. It is not an end, it is a means to an end. To be non-aligned is not an objective, it is only an instrument to achieve certain national, regional and international goals.

Therefore, the context might be changed; but the tool remains potent; it remains relevant. Our objective is peace, equality and human rights. To that extent, non-alignment gave us as a nation and gave many other nations, the independence of judgment, the ability to judge issues on their own merits. Therefore, non-alignment as an ideology of independence and dignity of nations is as relevant today as it was yesterday. What is the role that India is going to play? I have a feeling that we have forfeited our role. We seem to have gone to sleep. We cannot as a nation retreat into a self-spun cocoon or into a barren glass house. We cannot isolate ourselves from global trends where momentous changes are taking place. We have a duty and a responsibility to catalyse human aspirations into action, to give a direction to the forces of change towards the just world order that we talk about.

The seeds of tomorrow were sown yesterday and today new seeds are being sown. The harvest will not wait for us, and the harvest season shall pass by if we do not participate in sowing today.

India has a great role to play. We are a land of wisdom; we are microcosm for the world, has a plural and diverse society. Our experience has got a global relevance. We have inherited of the great philosophy of non-alignment from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We have failed in that. Even in our own neighbourhood, we have talked about our failures and shortcomings in Burma, in Afghanistan, in the Gulf, in Kampuchea, in the Indian ocean and in the Arab world. I do not know which to talk about. But I cannot go into the details. As the Prime Minister has very rightly said, tomorrow awaits us. nothing very much has been lost. Our objective must be clear.

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

Here I want to make a point for the consideration of the Hon. Minister. The entire concept of South Asia must be changed in the context of what is happening in the Soviet Union and Central Asia. To my mind, the Central Asian countries, which are now asserting themselves, must find a right place in South Asia. To that extent, our objective must be to redefine South Asia and then to articulate the common interests and aspirations, redefine its relationship to the other regions, particularly in the neighbouring regions of Arab World, South-East Asia, China and Japan.

I do not accuse the Foreign Office but I have a feeling sometimes that the Foreign Office has taken an overdose of sleeping pills. I think, they should become a little more active.

Finally, our credibility, as a power which does not stand for a *status quo*, as a force for change, as a globe trend-setter, will depend not only on our economic strength but as some people have pointed out, it will depend much more on our credentials as a democracy, as a secular order, as a welfare State and as a just society. In a recent report on human development, the United Nations Development Programme has ranked India - I am sorry to say - 123rd in the list of 160 States and 94th in the list of 127 developing States. With this performance, our voice cannot have much international force.

I would like India to play the role that we had visualised at the dawn of our freedom that we are for freedom and justice everywhere. I shall give a quotation from a great poem by Rabindranath Tagore where he wanted for the world and for the motherland:

"Freedom from fear...
Freedom from the burden of ages...
Freedom from shackles of slumber...

Freedom from the anarchy of a destiny,
whose sails are weakly yielded to blind
uncertain winds, and the helm to a hand ever rigid and cold as Death;

Freedom from the insult of the dwelling
in a puppet's world, where movements are
started through brainless wires, repeated
through mindless habits; where, figures
wait with patient obedience for a master of
show to be stirred into a moment's mimicry of life."

We refuse to be puppets. We shall take the destiny of our region in our hands and we shall try to make our contribution for the freedom and dignity of man. That should be the message of our foreign policy.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAJYCHAUDHURI (Serampore): Sir, significant and momentous changes have taken place in the international situation during the course of a brief period.

This is the period when we have seen how the mighty Unity States of America and its multinational allied forces under the pretext of defending peace went far beyond the UN mandate and committed a virtual genocide in Iraq. True that Iraq's action in Kuwait was indefensible but the way the US waged war against Iraq, even its civilian population, the way it acted as an international policeman, self-appointed and self-proclaimed, violated all norms of civilised international behaviour.

This is the period when we have seen how the UN body has been plundered away by the United States, how the UN has become silent spectator of the imperialist misdeeds. And this is the period when we find collapse of the USSR - the disintegration of the Soviet Socialist Union and in its place rise of several new States which are bent upon, at least for the time being, to bring back capitalism.

Sir, the recent event of the Soviet Union have been discussed by my esteemed colleagues here. The media is full of news and views on the developments there. And it is being said that socialism has failed there since it is now democratic. It is also said that since the world has become unipolar, our policy of Non-Alignment has become somewhat irrelevant. Sir, it is being suggested that time is now for reorientation of our foreign policy and to adopt a realistic ideological neutral policy.

Sir, whether one agrees with these observations or not, we cannot deny a central fact that USSR is not there. There are the independent Baltic States, there are Russia, Georzia, Azarbaijan and other republics whose future is unpredictable. Will it be a loose federation or just a confederation or a mere economic union? We do not know about this. Things there are in a state of flux. But these changes in the Soviet would have tremendous impact on our own country and on the Third World and that is our foremost concern. We should discuss this point.

Sir, when we attained independence, imperialism wanted to continue its exploitation by keeping our county a source of cheap raw material and a market for their industrial goods. At that time, there was none to offer us help and assistance which we badly required for our economic reconstruction and for our industrialisation. At this time, the Soviet Union can forward to help us. Sir, it is not that we alone received the Soviet support. Every Third World nation threatened by the menace of neo-colonialism got Soviet aid and assistance. Sir, while one is free to criticise socialism and socialistic system, it is a matter of one's own choice. But one cannot deny the basic fact that the Non-Aligned Movement had become so powerful and so much fast throughout the world because it had the support of the socialist Soviet. And today, the Non-Aligned Movement has become marginalised because socialist Soviet Union is not there to lend its earlier support. What manner of men are we if we gloat over the disintegration of that socialist Soviet Union? Sir, we know that Indo-Soviet Treaty is still there. But do we expect to receive the same assistance from the present rulers of Russia?

The new Russia is a stranger to us. And I do not know whether our External Affairs Ministry and our Government is considering all these aspects in the appropriate manner or not. The developments in the Soviet Union would not only adversely affect our economic programme but would also affect our strategic defence needs. The crucial balance of power in this entire region would tilt against us. We should not, for a moment, forget that there is still one UN Resolution for plebiscite in Kashmir. In the absence of a friendly USSR and in view of the changed character of the UN, who would be there in the Security Council to protect our interest?

What about Afghanistan? It is the only buffer secular State between us, Pakistan, the West Asian Islamic States and the Central Asian Republics of the erstwhile USSR. Now that the Central Asian Republics showing clear signs of propelling towards Islamic fundamentalism, importance of keeping Afghanistan secular is paramount. But the US is supporting ail the dark forces of absecurantism and fundamentalism. Would secularism in Afghanistan survive?

Then, the balkanisation of the Soviet comes. Would it not be embolden secessionism and separatism in our own country, i.e., in Punjab, Kashmir and Assam? We may rejoice over disintegration of the Soviet Union. But we ourselves live in a short of glass house. We should not forget that. The Hon. Minister appears to be impressed over the US stand on J&K. Our Government may think that after the end of the cold war, the US has acquired a human face. It would not support Pakistan's intransigence.

But what is our experience? What is the experience of the Third World countries? The experiences is that the US in the name of establishing a new international order, is

[Sh. Sudarsan Rajychaudhuri]

In fact pursuing a policy of hegemonism. It seeks to rule over the antire world. And when its own interests are involved, it does not respect anything. Is is not a fact that during the 80s, it was the United States that pampered Saddam Hussain against Iran. He was heavily militarised. Then Saddam Hussein was a darling, But when the same Saddam tried to assert himself, when he tried to assert Iraq's right over oil, be became a devil. And what have we seen in Iraq. 6000 Iraq soldiers have been literally buried by the advancing US Army. Civilians, old and inform, women and children were not spared. The sanctions against Iraq are still there. The entire population would be facing starvation.

What was the case of Noreiga in Panama. He too was a friend to the US, But when he became audacious enough to challenge the US interests in Panama, Canal, the US suddenly discovered vice in him. The US army invaded Panama. It is really funny to see the same US condemning Iraq's invasion on Kuwait. It is like the pot calling the kettle black.

It is true that the United States has recently shown a shift in its perception on the Kashmir issue. But to consider it a permanent, lasting and real shift in attitude may land us in trouble. Unfortunately, it appears that we have become mesmerised by thoughts of cozy relation with the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Among the parties, our views are not exactly identical with other views expressed. you must give us an opportunity to express our views. This is the only forum where we can do so and today is the last day. Please allow him.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAY CHOWDHARY: I will take three or four minutes and conclude. Sir, we have heard about the Harger Proposal who brought an amendment last year regarding favoured nations' status. Then we have also heard about Den Burtem who brought about a Bill asking for human rights inspection in Punjab and Kashmir and otherwise for suspending all aid to India. America's ambassador in Pakistan, Robert Oakley states that Kashmir is a disputed territory. He raked up the question of Plebiscite. We know all this. When we go through all these aspects, we would come to know that there is a sinister schizophrenia in America's perception on the Jammu and Kashmir issue.

Sir, this process has started from the days of Chandrashekhar Government when we allowed the US warplanes to have refuelling facilities in our country. Rajivji denounced that very rightly. It was an outright surrender. It was a deathblow to our policy of non-alignment which is and must be basically anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist.

But Rajivji is no more. Were he alive today, we would have known his reaction to the recent move of the Government uptill now a covert move to forge a so called cooperation plan between Indian and the US Defence Forces. It is reported that we are going to have one Indian-US joint army executive council. Even the possibility of a joint naval exercise is there. Are we going to be just another NATO nation? Nobody is opposed to friendship with the US people. But to forge friendship is one thing and to bend or even crawl in the name of forging friendship is different.

Unfortunately, it seems our Government is behaving in that fashion. In the name of warming up relations with the United States, whether in matters of economic policy or in matters of foreign policy, this trend is very much apparent. In fact our foreign policy has become just a tool of our economic policy. A cartoon in yesterday's *Times of India* has noted this. It is asked there if we have any other foreign policy besides inviting foreign capital. We have been restructuring our entire gamut of domestic as well as the foreign policy towards that objective - to invite foreign capital to invite tha multi-national companies.

Wa have seen how Pepsi is openly challenging our Governmant by flouting all contracts and obligations. Tha Government is halpless. And new Multi-national companies would also coma. What would we do if they also behave tha same way?

Our economic sovaraignty is in peril today. Tomorrow our political sovereignty would be endangared if wa do not seriously pondar over the situation.

Pepsi's role in overthrowing the Allende Govarnment in Chile is known to us. We also know how the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company eliminated Mossadagh Government in Iran in the 50s with the help of the CIA.

18.00 hrs.

We know what role did the United Fruit Company played in Guatemela to remove Arbenz Government. We should be cautious. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the caution is unfortunately not there.

The United States has been pressurising us on all the fronts - On the one hand to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and on the other hand to bend our patent Act, the Intellectual Property Right Act.

Are we going to capitulate? The fact that socialism in Soviet Union has suffered a great set back may have boosted the pro-U.S. lobby in our country. They are in a state of euphoria. They are advocating total change in our Foreign Policy. The disaster in Soviet Union does not mean that capitalism is the saviour of mankind. Neither capitalism can usher in a liberai, a democratic society. It only means that building socialism is not an easy programme. It would face fair weather and foul, trial and error. Socialism is a self-critical system and it cannot afford to be anti-democratic. It needs reform whenever necessary.

But can we support whatever is happening in the Soviet in the name of reform? They are talking of pluralist democracy. But they have banned the communist party. They are talking of freedom of expression and open-mindednass. But they have banned the Communist media. They are talking of modernity and progress. But they have torn tha red flag to bring back eagle-crested banner of the Czarist regime. They are talking of people's participation everywhere and we found that the President Gorbachav and Yoltsin hava signed an agreement saying that if anyone of them lives, the other will take ovar. What kind of people's participation is there and what type of democracy is this that we have to welcome and emulete?

Sir, the events of Soviet Union do not indicate that deys of socialism are over; days of fighting against imperialism are over. So long poverty and hunger remain, so long exploitation of man by man remains, so long nations suffer under the yoke of colonial and neo-colonialsubjugation, the spirit of socialism would never die.

Neither the spirit of Non-alignmant would die nor the spirit of fighting against imperialism, racism, neo-colonialisation would die. Nobody should think that debacla in the Soviet Union has made our planet more habitable. Nobody should think that the end of cold war, the rise of uni-polarism would allow us in tha third world rest and perhaps peace. Even after the signing of the START, nuclear weapons are there which can kill the entire humanity.

Tha changes that took place in the international situetion do not augur well for us. There are omnious portents. We heard that Soviet forces would leave Cuba but have we heard that the U.S. would dismantle its naval base in Guatamale in the Cuban territory? No.

We saw how Iraq has been punished; is being punished but have we heard that Israel has been forced to leave its occupied territories? No. The prospect of West Asian Peace Conference does not seem right.

[Sh. Sudarsan Rajychaudhuri]

Sir, new alignments are coming up. A new Europe, a mightier Europe would come up in 1992. New alignments of the advanced nations, developed nations would come up. Cold war is, as if going to be replaced by trade war. What shall we do in such a world.?

Time is now not to bend our policy of Non-Alignment. We should forge further alliance with the third world nations, with the developing world. Demand should be raised to restructure and revitalise the U.N.

If we in the 3rd world are united, if countries like ours, China, the developing nation of Asia, Africa, Latin America become united no power in the earth would be able to subjugate us. But are we going to do that? Or, as the Times of India Cartoon suggested we shall have no other foreign policy besides inviting foreign capitals.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Sir, I shall be brief and shall not touch the points which have already been referred to by the earlier speakers. Sir, there have been global changes and some changes are of momentous character also. Sir, the most momentous of the changes has been the events, the turmoil, in Soviet Union. I do not like to discuss in great detail about it. But today the Soviet Union ceases to be that Soviet Union which was the harvest of the great October socialist revolution. I have no hesitation in saying that the economic policies in the name of reforms in Soviet Union is nothing but a tread in the path of restoration of capitalism. In the name of so called reforms in political system, I think it is the CPSU which has been ideologically disarmed and it has been deprived of its legitimate role to play in the life of the Soviet Union and in the Communist Movement of the world.

Anyway, there might be somebody in the world and in this country also who may feel happy over this development in the Soviet Union. They may have an idea that this socialism has been dead all over the world. I would only like to remind them that socialism is immortal, socialism cannot die. There might have been certain temporary set-backs and the socialism will come to its own glory and place.

Even today, China has not changed its policy, although they have taken to the path of reforms. Cuba has not changed its basic policy although they have also accepted the policy of reforms. The reforms must be there in socialist society, in its economic policies and also in its political system. But that should be within the parameters of the socialism and not away from the socialist basis.

Coming to other points I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister that he has been unnecessarily a little soft towards the policy of the United States in the matter of retaining their global interest or in the matter of maintaining their global sway.

We welcome the START Agreement. This is a significant and a positive step in the direction of the cherished goal for full disarmament. But the United States has not abandoned its global strategy to dominate the whole world militarily and economically also. These things can be proved by two facts which have taken place very recently. One is the decision of the NATO to de-group their forces after the so called retreat of socialism in Europe and Soviet Union and also after the dissolution of the WARSAW Pact countries. There, they are trying to regroup themselves for their own ulterior purpose, particularly to maintain the military and economic superiority in the world.

The second thing is the decision to store a large quantity of equipment for deployment in Israel or the Middle-East in order to use them, if there is any regional conflict in the near future.

Finally, the United States of America has not abandoned the SDI Project. They have revived the SDI Project. Therefore, all these things show that the United States of America have not changed basically its character or are willing to go on their own way to establish their global domination or hegemony over the world.

The Hon. Minister has not also been careful to refer about the significance of the London Meeting of the G-7 which was held last month. The G-7 Economic Declaration, if the Hon. Minister had examined it, would have found that this Economic Declaration has called for signing of the Uruguay Round of Agreement by the end of this year. Perhaps, the Agreement denies the Third World countries the equitable terms of trade and equal relation. India and the Third World countries are putting up stiff resistance to the efforts of the G-7 countries.

In this connection, I would only like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to a public statement made by the Ambassador of the United States of America in New York that India should revise its thinking about the *intellectual property right and also India's* refusal to sign the Paris Convention on the Patent System.

Sir, I think the Hon. Minister will take note of it and take appropriate steps to see that the Government of India does not recapitulate to the pressure which is being mounted on them.

Sir, lastly, I come to the question of non-alignment. One of the basic ingredients of non-alignment is the perception of anti-imperialism. If this non-alignment is merely a non-alignment divorce of the basic concept of anti-imperialism, anti-neo-coloniaiism, non-alignment ceases to be non-alignment, non-alignment becomes weak and that is the policy which our Government has adopted or we accepted. Therefore, today the main confrontation is between the new economic order versus the new military order as President Bush's concept. The Third World countries require a new international economic order, whereas Mr. Bush and those G-7 want a new world order which means to dominate economically and militarily over the world. The Government of India should take proper steps to formulate its policy, so that they can strengthen the forces of the world which are fighting in the new internationai economic order.

The relations between India and China are to be further strengthened. Unfortunately some news has appeared and its genesis is from a the Chief Minister of a State and although it has been denied by the Chinese Government... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, what is not mentioned, and what is not meant, need not be referred on the floor of the House.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: He has made a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a very careful statement. You read it.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Before making this kind of a statement, the Government of India, particularly the External Affairs Ministry should be a iittie more careful.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no;

SHRI CHTTA BASU: We should not say anything which sours the relations between a great country like China and India. The relations with China are to be improved and we are working very seriously for it.

I think Cuba is in distress, is in difficulty and the Government of India should think as to how the Government can extend some kind of help to Cuba to maintain its status, to maintain its soiidarily, to maintain its programme.

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri): With the paucity of time I do not want to take much of the valuable time of this august House. I want to refer to one or two points, that is all.

It is really a matter of great satisfaction that the Hon. Prime Minister has mentioned in the House that within a short span of three months his Government has taken many initiatives in the affairs of the country's international affairs. But at the same time, I also may mention here some of the remarks by my honourable friends, with regard to the Gulf War and also the policy pursued by the our Government at that point of time and I am

[Sh. E. Ahamed]

of the opinion that India as a leader of the Non-alignmant movemant should have played a constructiva role at the time of the Gulf War. But unfortunately what has happened was very much regrettable. A country of the magnituda of India and also as the leading light of the non-alignment movement, should have taken an active part and the tradition of our foreign policy has been to intervene politically and energetically in any international crisis particularly when it threatens to war. India could have played a meaningful role in defusing the Gulf crisis. But what happened was quite contrary. And my hon. friend Shri Shahabuddin has also mentioned about the Foreign Affeirs Ministry. According to him they have taken overdose of sleeping pills. What I mean to say is that the Ministry as such is alert on all the matters concerned but it is the political executive, who have to make them to work in a proper way. What was the role of the External Affairs Minister at that time? When 12 millions of Indian national in the Gulf countries have been facing the serious problems created by Iraq's Invasion of Kuwait, our External Affairs Minister had gone and shook hands with Mr. Saddam Hussein, and described him as the best friend of India. This action gave a wrong signal to Arab countries, especially to the countries of Arab Council, Saudi Arabia, U.A.E., Oman, Qatar and Bahrain leave alone Kuwait. They were on the verge of throwing out of three countries due to this action of the the Extarnal Affairs Minister. Why did the then Government taka a decision of closing our embassy in Kuwait in deference to the wishes of Saddam Hussein?

Was it a right policy? How many Indian nationals have suffered due to this reckless decision taken by the then Government? Therefore, when the political executive, who have been acting in a wrong way, the burden cannot be put on the officers.

I am happy to know that India has been taking necessary steps to realise adequate compensation from the United Nations for those who fled away from Kuwait. In this respect, I would say that there were 1,72,000 Indian nationals in Kuwait and 10,000 Indian nationals in Iraq. Out of which, even according to the official estimate, 1,52,000 people have been repatriated. It is reported that the United Nations is intending to fix the quantum of compensation at 2,500 dollers as a maximum limit. India is a member of this Compensation Commission by virtue of its membership in the Security Council. As such, India can influence the decision of the Compensation Commission. Therefore, India should not only settle smaller claims but also they should settle the claims of those who have suffered personal injury and also those who have left their life's earnings left behind Kuwait. I urge upon the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs to prevail upon the U.N. Agency in fixing a maximum compensation after taking into account of the loss, damage end injury that our Indian nationals have suffered.

Our Party, Indian Union Muslim League, is fully committed to support tha Government of India in their policy towards Pakistan. We want normalisation with all the neighbouring countries, particularly with Pakistan. If the Pakistan Government cannot understand the real wishes of this country and the people of this country, they will be doing a disservice to the people of Pakistan.

Also I urge upon the Government to accord recognition as early as possibly to the Asian Republics in tha Soviet Union.

[*Translation*]

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have a little time left at our disposal and the hon.Members are getting impatient. I would take up only those points which have been left out. The Newspapers, Doordarshan and Akashvani have created such an atmosphere that has led the socialism to decline and it is on the brink of collapse. The separate entity of the Socialist world has crumbled down. The on going wrong propaganda has affected our foreign policy and is also affecting our economic policy.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, socialism is the best form of democracy and tha mora it is socialistic, the stronger it would be. It is true that it will not take its root easily and it also created complications, but the people like us have known its importance since childhood for that tha socialism has been made the base our Constitution. The democratisation will make socialism stronger. Tha old concept of *'Vasudhaive Kutambakam'* will also become stronger. With the hope that drawbacks experienced in democracy will be removed, we should march ahead.

Mr. Speaker, Sir the danders of cold war as well as the world war no more exist now but that have not vanished altogether. But even today, only America and the Soviet Union possess so much arms and atomic weapons that can raze the entire world to ashes. The Hon. Prime Minister has recently said that here is now only one super power having strategic supermacy in the world. This is wrong notion. Even the Americans admit that the soviet union is in no way less powerful to them not with standing financial crisis and recent political upheaval in Soviet Union. We are to continue our efforts for such treaties to be signed that could avoid the danger of war, establish peace and destroy the Inter-Continental Balislic Missiles and other arms. We wiil have look back to history to find out the reasons for the present Changes. There was a time when there prevailed the imperealism of Britain and France. At that time America was insignificant. Mussoldni always tried to meet Pandit Jawahar Lai Nehru, who was leader of the masses even when India was under the subjugation of Britishers. When Mussolini sought permission to see, Pandit Nehru he requested to meet him and said that he would not meet a person whose hands are red with the blood of Abyssanians. Thereafter, he want to Spain and gave a red salute to the then losing forces. Dr. Kotnis and Dr. Atal led a team to China.

Mr. Speaker, Sir I heard the sentiments expressed by the hon. Members. There is a need to seek cooperation of about 125 countries of the Third World and also the developed countries. I think a very little attention is being paid in this direction. In the present context Indo-China friendship has become all the more essential. I would like to emphasize that the changes that have taken place in China and recently in Russia have made it imperative to bring back the period of 'Hindi-Chini bhai bhai' for establishing peace, cooperation and for the welfare of tha Asia and the entire world. I would like to say later on the circumstances prevailing in the neighbouring country.

The hon. Prime Minister has made a reference to Nepal. I would like to submit that the Government is since committed to this cause though at the moment the problem seems to be in a tangle. Nepal is not like the other neighbouring countries. That is our brother country. Nature, culture , blood and language have forged this ralation. Therefore, a political dialogue should be held. We do not have any objection if talks are held at official level but political dialogue should be initiated for broad views and for keeping the future in mind. Our policy in respect of Nepal should not be that of tit-for-tat but instead we should adopt a liberal attitude. It should be just like that of a friendly Nation's attitude towards a smaller country. We should give a good treatment to Nepal without caring for our self-respect being hurt. This will be in the interest of both India and Nepal.

Shri Indrajit Gupta has recently said that many multipurpose schemes are pending. I think the main reasons behind that are misunderstanding, misconception and wrong views. I do not say that Nepal never commits mistake but we can improve the relations that is in our own hands.

Some friends have raised some points about Arab countries. We will have to see that the wave of democracy surges in these countries. We will have to remain friendly with all these countries. Saddam had committed a mistake but at that time Iraq had become the voice of the entire Arab world.

[Sh. Bhogendra Jha]

That was not the voice of Saddam only. We had adopted a right stand at that time. Before clearing our stand we should read the situation. The entire Arab World is extending a friendly hand to us and that is very necessary for the progress of the country. America has a hawk's eye on the oil reserves. We are glad that Shri Vajpayee has put the threat of America in the right perspective. Keeping the future in mind we should strengthen bonds of Indo-Arab friendship, Indo-China friendship and with other neighbouring countries and should march ahead.

The Hon. Prime Minister spoke at length about Pakistan and I think there is no need to say anything more. At the end I would like to say one thing. Comrade Indrajit Gupta rightly said the Doordarshan and Newspapers are free and are not presenting the correct picture particularly about socialist world and that has lead to disappointment, among the people. It is feared weather we can live in this world with our heads high. Such kind of publicity is adversely affecting the country and I would like that the media should propagate our traditions of self-respect and glorious heritage so that we could go ahead alongwith the progressive people of the world in achieving the targets secularism socialism and non-alignedment. We have to show to the entire world that the merry making by America is temporary and not a long lasting one.

We will enter an era of peace and our foreign policy should strengthen our Home policy as well as the relations with our neighbourers.

I would conclude after giving a suggestion about Pakistan. I think we are slow in improving our relations on financial matters. I do not want to go into the political matters but so far as financial matters are concerned, Pakistan is importing many items from abroad which India can export to Pakistan. We need to be more liberal in this matter so that the people of Pakistan should appreciate our attitude and policy towards Pakistan.

[*English*]

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ D. CHAVA (Karad): Mr. Speaker, Sir the recent momentous political events in the world have marked the end of the bipolar world based on military superiority as it existed since the World War II.

We have seen the end of the cold war, increased cooperation between superpowers, progress in disarmament and all these have given us a new hope of a lasting world peace.

The situation is still highly complex. Most third world countries are unsure about facing the ensuing 'unipolar' world, completely dominated by the West.

The success of market economy and the apparent failure of centrally planned approach to development—combined with the collapse of trade barriers and the emergence of various regional common markets—have created new power blocs, which are based on economic concepts rather than military and security considerations.

Friends, the Opposition Members have raised questions about our loss of prestige and loss of our pre-eminence among the third would and why India's voice is not being heard in the international fora.

Sir, I disagree with the analysis presented by them. There s a difference between the world of fifties and the world of today.

India's large population, large armed forces, the existence of power blocs based on security and military considerations and the fact that the Western powers were keen on keeping India democratic and not let it become a Communist power, were the reasons why India counted in the world affairs. But today the reality is different.

The recent political happenings in the Soviet Union and East Europe have perhaps no parallel in the recorded political history of the world. We are happy that the democratic values which we hold dear have been vindicated.

A lot has been said about the India response to those fateful events last August. Our official statement that the coup we an internal affair of the Soviet Union was the absolutely correct response. Any other statement supporting one or the other side would have amounted to an interference in the internal affairs of a friendly nation.

Sir, there is an important principle involved here. If we start commenting on the internal affairs of other countries, about personalities, about our preference for a particular leader, then we would have to concede a similar right to other nations to talk about our internal affairs. And who can stop them from asking us about human rights or democracy in Punjab, Kashmir and Assam? Sir, whatever form of Government may ultimately emerge in Soviet Union, it would be proper time for us to convey our deep sense of gratitude for the unflinching support extended by the Soviet Union to this nation—in the international fora, on the economic matters, in fight for equitable economic world order and against exploitation and colonialisation.

The Soviet situation is still fluid. India will have to develop bilateral relations with each of the Soviet Republics which become independent. I am happy that the process has started. The whole situation must be reviewed when the Union Treaty is accepted.

There is also the question of continuity of defence supplies and spares. The problem of rupee trade and the more realistic rouble-rupee exchange rate is, to be resolved.

Sir, closer to home, the whole country is deeply disturbed about our relations with Pakistan and their open support for the terrorists in Punjab and kashmir. The current aggressive posture of Pakistan is a direct result of the growth of Hindu fundamentalism in India. It is a direct result of the gains made by the communal forces in the 1989 and the 1991 elections. And also due to decisions by the National Front Government, at the behest of their allies, to dismantle the democratic functioning in Kashmir. Pakistan is now exploiting the internal situation in India. The attempts by Pakistan Government to internationalise the Kashmir issue must be strongly deplored. The Minister of External Affairs was successful in stopping Pakistan's attempts to raise Kashmir issue in NAM Foreign Ministers Conference in Accara.

The Government must take some strong action. To begin with we must launch an 'Information counter-offensive' by making films, TV programmes, arranging visits by foreign journalists and by publishing evidence of Pakistani actions in aiding and abating terrorist violence in Kashmir and Punjab and blatent interference in our internal affairs.

Restoration of democratic process in Kashmir will be an important step. We would like to know what is Pakistan's position of SAARC convention on terrorism which was arrived at the Male—Conference of SAARC Council of Ministers.

Sir, No discussion of international situation can be complete without a reference to the NAM. Thirty years ago NAM set itself an agenda of peaceful co-existence and of struggle against colonialisation and racism. Today we can say, without the slightest reservations, that the Movement has fully succeeded in its initial agenda. And if the world appears more safe, due credit has to be given to the important role by NAM and to the India leadership of the Movement. Today there are attempts to redefine the role of NAM. In the recent Foreign Ministers' conference at Accara the some countries wanted to rename it and to merge it with G-77. G-77 is an economic grouping while NAM is political. It was good that no one

[Sh. Prithviraj D. Chavan]

accepted it. India must see that NAM is not marginalised. It must be reinvigorated on the basis of six point Belgrade Plan, which includes:

(a) equitable economic order

(b) restructuring of U.N.

(e) peace and disarmament

(d) human rights, and

(e) environmantally safe development

The Movement will hava to be given an economic orientetion. The naw issues before the movement must be:

(a) solution to crippling debt burdan

(b) Trade related issues

(c) remunerating commodity prices

(d) drug related terrorism

(e) Transfer of technology to the third world and

(f) stable monetary condition

We are happy that India is forming G-15. In the forthcoming Carracus meeting, We must have concrete proposals report of the South-South Commission and our response to G-7.

In conclusion, it would be worthwhile remembering that it was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who said that : "the ultimate test of a country's independence was the independence of its foreign policy".

Today our independence to shape our own policy will fast erode, if we do not overcome our economic problems. The recent economic reforms, policy of liberalisation and the political will to enforce financial discipline, will be very important. The world may have become militarily Unipolar, but in the context of new economic power blocs, the world has really become Multipolar.

The battle for world domination tomorrow will be fought not with tanks, fighter aircrafts and carriers and missiles, but with economic weapons such as trade barriers, export quotas, commodity pricing, exchange rates, balance of payments intellectual property Rights, brain drain and flow of modern technology. Sir,only an economically strong and politically united India will be able to play e significant role in world affairs.

[*Translation*]

*SHRI M.V.V.S. MURTHY (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the out set I express my gratitude to you for providing me time to speak on international situation.

The recent developments both structural and political in Soviet Union provide us en opportunity to improve our relations with that country. We should work for the close Indo-Soviet relations in the days ahead.

Sir, Indian efforts to establish a close relationship in trade, technology and other fields with United States of America are yielding good results. The changed situation around the globe call for further strengthening of there relations with that country.

The scenario in Europe has undergone a sea-change. The real politic has replaced the ideology based politics. They departed from the past thinking. The unification of Germany has taken place. The will of the German people for an united State has thus materialised. Europe Parliament has emerged. The common market is gaining momentum. Europe is fast emerging as an important political and economic force on the world scene. We , in India should take note of the changed scenario in Europe and work for a closer political and economical relationship with European Community. That will contributa to world peace at large. In 1991, our President, Shri R. Venkatraman and the then Foreign Minister, Shri I.K. Gujral visited several European countries.

---

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Telugu.

[English]

HON. SPEAKER: please come neaver the mike. You are not audible.

[Translation]

*SHRI M.V.V.S. MURTHY: Because of their discussions with various Heads of State and other leaders, there is every possibility to increase our exports to those nations. European Common Market, which is going to be formed in 1992 would provide an opportunity to boost our trade with those countries. We should try our best to utilize this golden opportunity by exporting more to European nations. Thus we can improve our dwindling foreign exchange reserves and improve our economy.

The situation is East European countries has also changed a lot. The waves of democracy are sweeping the entries eastern Europe. Keeping this is view, we have to reshape our East European policy so as to better our relations both political and economic with these countries.

We should endeavour to improve our relationship both political and economic with all the nations in the world. The changed international scenario calls for such a close cooperation with all the nations. India had been a staunch supporter of a separate home-land for palestinians. Only an independent palastine can guarantee the durable peace in West. Asia. India had been supporting the just demands of palestinian people. In 1990, Shri I.K. Gujral, the then Foreign Minister, while participating in NAM Conference, advocated the rights of palestinians for a home-land of their own. He made the policy of the Govt. of India clear in that meeting. He said that the arb terrorists should vacate the occupied areas and the land be restored to palestians. He said that this was the only way for an enduring peace in the region. I feel that this policy is on correct lines.

The release of Nelson Mandela by the South African Government brought immense pleasure to the people of India. India always supported the policies of African National Congress. Africans derive their strength from the support extended by India in their struggle against racial descrimination. Indian policy has been contributing to the peaceful coexistance and cooperation among various races in that continent. It is a source of strength in their fight against injustice.

Sir, I will not take more time. Sir, economic independence is a must if we want to persue an independent foreign policy. Even Non-alignment Policy will not be effective if the NAM countries are not independent economically. The voice o NAM countries will not be heard in the world if these nations are not economically independent. Hence, we should take steps to improve our economy. Only an economically independent India can play its role effectively in the comity of nations.

Economic independence is necessary for political independence. I hope an economically and politically stronger India would emerge in the years to come and play an important role in solving all the major problems the mankind is facing today around the globe.

With these words I conclude my speech once again thanking you for the opportunity you have given me to speak.

PROF. PREM DHUMAL (Hamirpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir I am thanking to you for giving me a chance to speak at the last moment on the last day of the session. Today, we are dicussing the global situation in the House. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is necessary that

---

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Telugu.

[Prof. Prem Dhumal]

while making a proper assessment of the global situation we should also decide as to what should be our foreign policy in the same context. It is all the more necessary to forsee the developments likely to take place around the world. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bharatiya Janata party anticipating the current developments had mentioned the following clearly in its election manifesto:-

[*English*]

> "With the sudden disappearance of bipolar divide of 45 years, the USSR and US are no longer adversaries, but partners. Curtain has finally been drawn over the Cold War that has dominated the world for most of the current century.
>
> International equations are changing fast. In the post Cold War period, neither the USA needs the Third World countries to contain communism, nor does the USSR has any use now for its "natural allies" in the developing world.
>
> The new situation is a challenging one and at the same time, pregnent with several fresh opportunities to enlarge India's role in global affairs. But only economically healthy, militarily strong and progressive India can carve out a nitche for itself."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Pakistan makes propaganda against us and tries to raise the Kashmir issue time and again at the international platforms, is causing much concern for us. This is a serious matter. Last year, the Pakistani delegate had raised this issue in the inter-Parliamentary union held in Uruguay in which I fortunately had the opportunity to represent India as a delegate. A British M.P. in whose constituency large number of Pakistan nationals live supported Pakistan delegate's views. After listening to them I had given a reply on behalf of India that Kashmir is our internal matter in which no one has a right to interfere. I want to say that Pakistan does not miss any opportunity from raising this issue at the international platforms. We come across all this reports in the newspapers. Just a while ago while intervening in the debate the Prime Minister said that such and such reports had been received from Pakistan. When I asked him,

[*English*]

Now, where do we stand, he said, 'we stand where we were.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we just say that Pakistan is not fulfilling its commitments finish off our responsibility to our Foreign Policy. In this way no progress is made in this direction and we stand where we were? Are we correctly anticipating the international situation? This is a fact that the Embassies of Pakistan all over the world are mostly engaged in making anti-India propagandas. But we are not giving a befitting reply. In terms of diplomacy we are a failure. Policy decisions in this regard are not being taken by experts. We should make our Embassies more active so that they might work with a sense of purpose. As has been said by our hon. leader, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee just now that the people of Indian origin living abroad should also be persuaded to put India's side. While the embassies will do their duties there the people will also take a leading role in putting forward Indian view points in foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before concluding I would like to make a few suggestions to the hon. Minister. The policy making committee must be constituted of experts so that a long-term foreign policy could be framed. We should emphasise on the common market for the countries which support our stand. We should extend all out help to protect the rights and interests of the people of Indian origin living abroad. A national consensus may be arrived at on our foreign policy. While we may continue with the North-South dialogue, we should also make endeavours for the south-south co-operation. Now I would like to make one more submission about Pakistan taking advantage of the situation prevailing in Jammu and Kashmir. I would like to know whether we are ready to take diplomatic steps for exploiting the situation in Pak-occupied Kashmir just as Pakistan is creating disturbances in our country. Because the situation in Pak occupied Kashmir is also not satisfactory. With these words I conclude.

SHRI A. ASOKARAJ (Perambalur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of All India Anna DMK, I wish to say a few words.

At the time of independence of India, the world was divided into two blocs sharply. It was pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who formulated the Non-Aligned policy. Before four decades, India was supporting all the countries in the freedom struggle both morally and politically. India was supporting the right and opposing the wrong without any fear. India earned a good name at that time.

Then, India got a good friendship with the Soviet Union. After the changes that have taken place in the Soviet Union, the question arises whether the friendship with the Soviet Union should continue or not. My opinion is that whatever the internal changes, our friendship with the Soviet Union should continue.

Similarly, some hon. Members raised the question whether the Non-Aligned policy, that is, NAM has any relevance now. We should not forget that as long as there are poor developing countries on the one side and rich nations on the other side, the role of NAM to fight for a new economic order becomes much more essential.

We have brought about a great change in our country's industrial policy and trade policy. Some of the foreign countries have expressed their fear and concern over the new industrial and trade policy. They have their own doubt whether India would continue these policies or not. We have to create confidence in the minds of the foreign countries so that they will come forward to help us without any hesitation.

I would like to know what are the plans that we are having in this direction. Our Ambassadors in the foreign countries should be instructed suitable to function effectively to create an atmosphere of confidence and trust-worthiness. Then only, we can achieve the goal with the announcement of new Industrial and trade policies.

There is a doubt in the Minds of some foreign countries wether India is politically strong or not. The secessionists and terrorists are giving so much of troubles and threat to the life of everybody. JKLF in Jammu and Kashmir, ULFA in Assam and Punjab terrorists are already creating trouble in those States and slowly those States are going to their hands. I do not understand why we are unable to arrest the activities of the terrorists. The foreign countries should not think that we are weak and are not able to solve the problems posed by these secessionists and terrorists. So, we have to prove our credibility and strength.

Similarly, we have to develop our friendship with our neighbouring countries on a firm foundation. Unforuantely, our neighbouring country Pakistan is helping the Punjab terrorists in order to give trouble to India. China is supplying arms and ammunitions to Pakistan is a large scale. China is going to supply nuclear submarine to Pakistan. India should try to have cordial relationship with all these countries.

We had an agreement with the Sri Lankan Government namely the Shastri-Srimovo Agreement and the Sri Lankan Government is not implementing this agreement. We have honoured the agreement by bringing lakhs of people from Sri Lanka to India. But Sri Lanka failed to implement the agreement. Then, another agreement was singed between Indian Government and the Sri Lankan Government and India honoured the agreement by handing over the kachchatheevu to Sri Lanka. At that time, Sri

[Sh. A. Asokaraj]

Lanka accepted to give fishing rights to the Tamil Nadu fisherman. But now the Sri Lankan Government is not honouring the agreement. The Sri Lanka Navy is giving so much of trouble to the fishermen of Tamil Nadu by drowning their boats into the sea and more then 27 persons died because of indiscriminate and unwarranted gun fire by the Sri Lankan Navy. Hundreds of persons were injured during the attack of the Sri Lanka Navy. That is why the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister hon. Puratchi Thalaivi Selvi Jayalalitha demanded the immediate intervention of the Central Government to cancel the agreement of the year 1974 and get back the kachchateevu to India. Then only the Tamil Nadu fishermen will be saved from such troubles from the Sri Lankan Navy.

After this agreement, there was another agreement which was made between India and Sri Lanka by Shri Rajiv Gandhi and Shri Jayawardane in the year 1986. By this agreement India sent the Indian Peace keeping Fore to Sri Lanka in order to keep peace there. But the Sri Lankan Government did not give any power, as accepted, to the Tamil there. I would also like to mention that our leader puratchi Thalaivi Jayalalitha is also facing danger to her life from the LTTE militants. The Sri Lankan Government is the root cause for all these happenings, all these miseries and troubles. In spite of all these things, India wants to have a cordial relation with Sri Lanka.

To attain good relationship with neighbouring countries, we have to strive hard to dispel the misgivings and make them realise that we do not have any territorial ambition. In any event, the time-tested foreign policy of India should continue. But to give strength to this policy, India should become strong.

With these words, I conclude.

[*Translation*]

SHRI CHANDULAL CHANDRAKAR (Durg): Mr. Speaker, Sir in view of some historical and far reaching consequences taking place in the international sphere, it becomes imperative for us to consider the fallout seriously. It cannot be exactly said what would be the outcome of the recent changes in Europe. It is, therefore, necessary that we should make a basic change in the working of our Embassies in different countries. Only those people who are nationalists committed and who have a missionary Zeal should be allowed to work in them. I have observed the functioning of our Embassies. They work in a low pace. They are slack and they follow the western style. So, the style of functioning of these embassies will have to be changed completely. We are required to consider seriously the recent changes in the world, and its long-term impact. Today change took place in Russia in Europe. We should not think that with the change Russia has become weak. Some people rear such a misunderstanding in their mind. We should also seriously consider the impact of the re-unification of Germany. Certainly, it is gong to be a centre of economic powers, Japan is also our neighbour country. So we should also keep our eyes on the changes taking place there and in other neighbour countries. We should equally observe the economic power centres emerging in the world. We should take the emergence of these new centres into account and bring some revolutionary change in the style of functioning of our embassies. There is surplus staff in our embassies in America and Britain. They are not dedicated or committed employees. There is no harm if their number is small. The Ministry must give proper guidance to them to bring a change in their style of functioning. In addition their staff strength must be reduced by an order. There is no doubt about the fact that Russia had been a centre of power and no power of the world can prevent China which has a population of 100 crores from becoming a centre of power. Our country also has a population of 85 crores. We should also make improvements in our economic condition and demonstrate our power before the world. In the same time it is all the more necessary that we should not lag behind anywhere in the international forums in taking initatives. We should keep up tha tempo that prevailed during the timas of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi. We should make our Embassies more active. Our thoughts and ideologies must echo no every international platform through our Embassies. Then only our policy and progress can reach all over the world. The way we have been raising various issues, we have been lagging behind in every sphere.

Atal Bihariji expressed his views here very elegantly. He said that communism has come to an end in Russia. But we should not break our treaty of friendship we have made for exchanging our culture with Russia. It should be our endeavour to continue the relationship. In the International forum India and Russia should remain as friends and keep it up for future also. Today it is being said that due to the situation prevailing in Russia peace has come in the international fields and America has emerged as the sole super power in the world. In this connection I would like to say that after some years situation will change and Russia will again emerge as a new power in the World.

[English]

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): Mr. Speaker, Sir I am glad that our House has been able to find time to discuss the international situation at long last. Something is always better than nothing. But Mr, Speaker, to be quite candid, this is just not good enough. The Prime Minister has been good enough for his part to assure us that next year, in the next Budget, there will be adequate discussion on the Demands for Grants on the External Affairs Ministry. But this will not do. I think, we need to make up for this lapse in the next session.

MR. SPEAKER: Had we discussed the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry, we would have discussed it for six hours. But we have discussed it for five hours.

SHRI INDER JIT: I would venture to submit, in keeping with the traditions of this House, we ought to have a full-fledged discussion in the next session and not wait until the Budget Session is over.

MR. SPEAKER: We will try to do that.

(*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: In the next session, budget cannot be discussed.

SHRI INDER JIT: We should discuss the international situation because I do not have to tell this House that cataclasmic changes have taken place all over the world. It is really distressing that we should not be discussing all these things at great length. And all of us who have much to say are being asked to limit our remarks to a bear few minutes.

However, I shall try to do my best in the limited time available to me. In my opinion, one of the greatest failings of our foreign policy over the last four decades has been that we generally seem to react, we seldom act. And, I think, it is time that our foreign office started thinking more in terms of acting ráther than merely reacting. I think, this goes as much for the Council of Ministers. In terms of acting, the kind of action we have to take, we now find that the whole world and more particularly the uni-polar world seem to be hurtling very fast. President Bush has been talking in terms of new world order. I do think, that we should try and understand what his perception of this new world order is and where we fit in.

19.00 hrs.

Do we fit into his concept and his perception of the new world order? If we do not than we ought to have counter strategy so that we can protect our interests adequately. This is very necessary and this is where we need to act very very carefully and very dynamically.

The other thing which we have spoken

[Sh. Inder Jit]

about is the question of reform of the United Nations. This is an issue which we have been taking up at the United Nations itself for the past 15 years. I recall, it was my privilege in 1977 to go to the United Nations as a member of the Indian delegation and I was a member to the Sixth Committee. We then strongly advocated the need for a reform of the United Nations. we had a great deal of support from all sides except, surprisingly at that time, from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, at that time, had insisted on consensus approach and then we had to say that we could not become prisoners of consensus. I hope that we can pursue the question of reform of the United Nations more vigorously and democratise it as as being generally suggested. We have also the question of Non-Aligned Movement.

I shave not many tears to shed if the Non-Aligned Movement goes up in smoke. Nevertheless, I must make it clear that I am talking about the Non-Alignment as it is today. I have personally felt greatly disappointed in the kind of the quality of the non-alignment that the Non-Aligned Movement had pursued. It had concentrated more on quantity and as a result of which, we diluted the concept and the quality of non-alignment. It must rather have a small group of countries, dedicated to non-alignment.

I do believe that non-alignment has a role. It has a role today and it shall continue to have a role in the future too. I say this because, in my opinion, non-alignment is nothing else but the projection of a country's independence at home, to independence at abroad. And we must retain this independence and judge all issues on merit. But, if we are going to continue, even if all by ourselves, we must remain non-aligned. I think, we should try and get a group of countries which would truly be non-aligned.

The next thing to which I would like to devote to in the very limited time that Is available to me is about the question of Pakistan.

I think there is a great deal of disappointment on that score. Pakistan is at the moment busy in mounting and continues to mount a proxy war on us. And I regret to say that we have not been able to find an adequate answer to this, in addition to the problem of Kashmir. For the first time,we have a situation in which the United States has come out openly in support of us. It has opposed any talk of plebiscite. It has supported our stand that we must seek to find a solution within the four walls of the Simla agreement and yet we have not been able to mobilise the world option on this issue. I think that there is something wrong with our efforts at projecting our policies. I think that there is need for injecting greater dynamism into the kind of lobby which is needed abroad. This is just not happening. In fact, as other friends have said, Pakistan seems to be scoring over us, times out of number, in regard to the Kashmir issue. I think we have a very strong case in regard to human rights and yet we have not been able to project this. We have a situation where Pakistani trained terrorists are coming into our country. Even some of the Pakistanis themselves, posing as terrorists are coming in and butchering our peace loving people and yet there is little that we have been able to do. We must mount a very special effort at projecting our policy and our stand.

Another thing which I would like to say in regard to Pakistan is that it is time for us to take a good loot at the policies that we are pursuing over the last 40 years. Initially we had wars with Pakistan. Subsequently we have tried to be friendly with Pakistan. Every time we tried and embraced Pakistan; we tried and moved closely. Friends here even today have suggested that we should take unilateral decisions in terms of trying to be closer to Pakistan, making gestures after gestures. And yet what is the response? The response is one of pushing us away. I think a time has come when we might think in terms of leaving them coldly aloof, responding to only such gestures as Pakistan does. Every time our bending over backwards created unnecessary suspicions and it has not produced results. I think we should leave Pakistan to itself and whenever it makes a gesture towards us, we should be willing to make for every gesture, two gestures. I think the time has come when we must stop to hug them, to embrace them because this has not yielded any result.

If I might just make one more point, I return to the original concept of new world order that I talked about. At the moment we need to be a little more careful about the new winds of change; more than change, in terms of giving the people an opportunity to express themselves. With the kind of situation that has arisen in the Soviet Union, in the new order, every country, every part of a country is being encouraged to express themselves in terms of what they wish to do. Where the new world order comes, we should be very clear that the unity and integrity of established countries like India will not be compromised in any concept of a new world order.

It is very well for the Americans. If the Americans are interested in the new world order of injecting this new concept of self-determination, I think we should be very clear that this concept should be considered only if the Americans are willing to give the right of self-determination to their own States and so long as they are not willing to give the right of self-determination to their own States, we should beware of this particular concept.

I just want to make one more point in terms of South-North dialogue. I think enough has not been done. We need to push ourselves a lot more in terms of North-South dialogue. Equally we need to push a lot stronger in terms of the South-South dialogue. It is a matter of great distress that initially certain ideas which were projected, certain ideas which were evolved in terms of getting three countries of the non-aligned movement, the Egyptians, the Yugoslav and India to cooperate; that did not work. I think there is need to go into this very very carefully. So long as we *cannot* get South-South cooperation, we *cannot move further* on to this very desirable goal of North-South cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for enabling me to speak, for giving me an opportunity to speak, although one had to rather rush with force.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset thank all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate for their valuable suggestions? I don't mention this as a matter of formal courtesy because I know that most of the speakers and in fact some who did not speak this evening are the people who have devoted many years to the study of foreign policy issues. Some of them indeed have been as ministers or senior officers responsible for formulating these policies.

Further, my task now is a limited one in view of the fact that hon. Prime Minister in his intervention has laid the broad perspective and the broad canvass. While doing so he has answered many of the concrete points and therefore I will restrict myself to specifically answering some of the queries that remain unanswered so far.

At the very outset in this debate a point was raised as to whether we have a policy planning mechanism at all to plan our foreign policy strategies and options. The answer is yes, we have a policy planning division in the Ministry. But we shall strengthen the structures in the policy planning division in the Ministry and if necessary take further other steps so that we really have more and more involvement of leaders and experts in putting our responses to the world.

As has been pointed, these responses have been consensus of the country, have been the consensus of Parliament. Therefore, there is no reason why people who may differ on domestic issues because of the consensusal approach to the foreign policy should not be involved or acquainted with what we intend to do. We will also have the *benefit of their advice on options that are available to us.*

A question has been raised by the last

[Sh. Eduardo Faleiro]

speaker and many speakers before him, right from the very beginning as to what are we doing to counter the mischievous disinformation campaign and its attempts to violate the international law by violating the Simla Agreement and bringing in issues that are extraneous in international conferences and otherwise. It is not correct to say that we have not very successfully—particularly in recent times—rebutted this malicious campaign. In fact, one of the speakers was candid enough in saying that we were not doing enough to stop this propaganda; he mentioned specifically the name of a country and said that accepting the Simla Agreement of bilateralism is the only way of settling the Kashmir issue. He very candidly said—I am grateful to him—and pointed out the success of our approaches to uncover the truth and to point out the disinformation from Pakistan. It is a fact that more and more countries, more and more Governments are coming round that view. So, the issue of Kashmir is an issue to be settled bilaterally within the framework of the Simla Agreement by negotiated and peaceful procedure. Secondly Pakistani administration is helping terrorism, is arming them, aiding and abetting terrorism both in Kashmir and in Punjab.

SHRI. INDERJIT: You have succeeded only in regard to one country.

SHRI. EDUARDO FALEIRO: You prevent me from mentioning several other countries. But, I can mention United Kingdom, that has already been mantioned here. I could mention and I will mention what the commonwealth Secretary-General said here just a few days ago. He said that this is a bilateral issue. I could mention and will now mention what was said in ACCRA meeting when Pakistan was rebutted for raising this issue and was told that bilateral issues of this type are not brought in, the international forum like the Non-Alignment Movement.

Speaking about the non-alignment movement, a question was raised as to are we looking into these issues with a vision or are we just tinkering here and there. We do realise the need for a vision for the non-alignment movement at this cross-roads of history. The world has undergone radical changes. I would specifically say that at the next non-alignment summit meeting, India proposes to advance the cause of disarmament, advance the cause and obtain a discussion on our concept of a nuclear-free non-violent world. India proposes to advance the economic issues by discussing the subject of how to give content, substance and dynamism to North-South dialogue and also to find out ways and means to strengthen South-South cooperation. We keep on talking about South-South cooperation. Where we lack is not in talking about the generalities of South-South cooperation; where we lack is finding specific operational ways in which South-South cooperation will indeed be implemented. Therefore, we intend to raise this in the next summit meeting of the non-alignment movement. We will also take up at the next summit meeting of the non-alignment movement, the question of strengthening the United Nations machinery. It is basically the question of expending and democratising the United Nations Security Council because Security Council is in fact the major, if not the only decision, making body of the UN. When we say expending the Security Council, we keep in mind basically expending the membership of the Security Council by giving a greater representation to the countries of the South, developing countries, the non-aligned countries.

A question has been raised here on China by several eminent speakers, that we should strengthen the relations with China. We fully endorse these views. Yes, China is a powerful country. We had historic relations with China. The need of the hour is to strengthen these relations. Late Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi in fact, made a breakthrough in our relationship with China. It was followed after Rajiv Gandhi, by several contacts. I am happy to say that many Members of Parliament have participated in these contacts which have been on science and technology, which have been on political and cultural. Recently we have signed with

China, a cultural exchange programme. 'Asian personality', yes, we have an Asian personality—all of us individually and collectively—both India and China. And we cannot divert ourselves nor do we to divert ourselves off our Asian personality. I would like to say here that China was a prominent participant in the 48th anniversary of the Asian Relations Conference which was celebrated in Delhi in 1987, if I am not mistaken.

Quite apart from being an Asian country, I must say here that we share many common perceptions on the present global developments and particularly on many specific issues.

Environment is becoming more and more an issue to be taken up at the international forum. In days to come, environment is the major issue in international discussion. So, India took the initiative in getting a consensus of the developing countries on a strategy to deal with this question of environment. The meeting was held in Delhi and that was followed up in Beijing in June last. That is just one example of how we share the pattern, how we cooperate not even bilaterally but also on multilateral issues.

A question was raised on cooperation with ASEAN. Yes, we want to cooperate with ASEAN. We have asked for the sectoral dialogue partnership. They have two types of what you could call, observer status or non-members participating in their process. One is the total membership for general dialogue which is basically of donor countries in the ASEAN. So, it is the donor-donee relationship. Another is a sectoral dialogue on the specific issues. We have asked to be made a sectoral dialogue partner in ASEAN.

Mr. Chitta Basu, while talking everything about China, has also referred to the Statement of Chief Minister and regarding some issue which was also raised in the House. I would like to inform the House that there has been a denial. We have noted a denial issued by the Chinese Government which stated further that China observed the five principles of peaceful co-existence and will not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

Being on that region for a moment more, we are a Member of the Paris Conference that is dealing with the Cambodian issue. We have been closely associated with peace processes in Cambodia. The Combodian settlement, that is emerging now, is precisely on the principles that we have advocated. They are: number one, that there should be a cease-fire without waiting for a comprehensive political settlement; number two, there should be an agreement not to supply arms to the warring factions in Cambodia; number three, there should be a phased demobilisation. These are not all the points. These are some of the major points. All these ideas have been accepted and our role acknowledged.

As far as constitution of a peace-keeping force is concerned, it has not yet been put together. so, it will be premature to say whether India will or will not be in that set-up.

Mr. Indrajit Gupta and other Members raised the question of humanitarian aid to the suffering people, especially women and children—civilian population—in Iraq and asked what are we doing in the Security Council in this regard. I would like to inform the House that we have consistently advocated that the Security Council should take measures to permit the supply of food and medicines to the civilian people, to the people of Iraq. The Security Council Resolution 706, supported by India, has now authorised sale of Iraqi oil to the tune of $ 1.6 billion to finance the purchase of food and medicines to the people of Iraq.

I have only one point to answer. It concerns our economic policy and the economic content of our foreign policy. We have instructed our ambassadors in specific countries to restructure their embassies to ensure that they become more active and aggressive in the promotion of exports and in the attraction of investment and technology. We are planning a series of training programme

[Sh. Eduardo Faleiro]

for our officers amongst whom there is already considerable expertise. We are also ensuring that the missions are properly equipped with data needed both by our exporters and by our foreign businessmen interested in business. So, I do not want to take any more time of this House.

Once again I thank you personally, Mr. Speaker, for providing this time for the discussion and thank all the hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Speaker Sir, the points contained in my Substitute Motion have already been made by my senior colleague, Atalji and various other friends. Therefore, I do not wish to press it.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: Sir, I am glad that the Prime Minister has assured this House that from now till the next Budget, many initiatives will be taken which were lacking nd the Minister of State also has said that we are taking up many programmer so that India' s role becomes a leading role in the Non-Aligned Movement. In view of this, I am also not pressing my Motion.

SHRI E. AHAMED: Sir, in view of the opinion expressed by the hon. Minister that adequate compensation will be made available by the United Nations to Indian nationals who suffered by Iraq's invasinca Kuwait I also shall not press for my Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Have the Members leave of the House to withdraw their substitute motions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

Substitute Motions were, by leave, withdrawn

19.22 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha:-

> " In accordance with the provisions of Sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Punjab Appropriation (Vote on Account) No.2 Bill, 1991 which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 16th September, 1991 and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill".

19.22 1/2 hrs.

THE CONSTITUTION (SCHEDULED TRIBES) ORDER (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL , 1991

[English]

SECRETARY GENERA: Sir, I lay on the Table the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order (Second Amendment) Bill, 1991, passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current session and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the House on the 17th September, 1991.

19.23 hrs.

RESIGNATION BY MEMBER

[English]

MR. SPEAKERL I have to inform the House that Shri. Ajit Anantrao Pawar gave me a letter personally yesterday offering his resignation of the Membership of this House with effect from 18th September, 1991 and that I have accepted his resignation.
